

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 508

JC 730 147

AUTHOR Trent, James W.; And Others
 TITLE The Study of Junior Colleges. Volume II, Diverse Dimensions of Community Colleges: Case Studies of 15 Institutions.
 INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
 SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Statistics (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Dec 72
 CONTRACT OEC-0-70-4795
 NOTE 222p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$9.87
 DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Case Studies; *Community Colleges; Counselor Characteristics; *Junior Colleges; Student Characteristics; *Surveys; Teacher Characteristics; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

Volume II of The Study of Junior Colleges contains the results of the case studies and concomitant surveys. This volume describes the exploratory study of 15 types of junior colleges, which formed the core of the project. Emphasis was on assessing the impact of these institutions on the students they enroll. The volume includes an explanation of the study design and methodology, the descriptive surveys (profiles) of the institutions and their administrators, students, faculty, and counselors; indications of institutional differences on numerous variables; and the implications of these data for needed research and development. (For related documents, see JC 730 146, 148-149.) (KM)

ED 077508

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Contract No. OEC-0-70-4795

VOLUME II DIVERSE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES CASE STUDIES OF 15 INSTITUTIONS

By
James W. Trent, Principal Investigator
Barbara Dorf
Ronald Hart
Felice Karman
Robert Malmgren

with
Glenn F. Nyre

December 1972

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
UCLA
Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California

Educational Research and Development

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
U.S. Office of Education
National Center for Educational Statistics

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 13 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 730 147

Preface

The present volume is the second of three reporting on The Study of Junior Colleges undertaken in conjunction with the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation for the U.S. Office of Education. The project was initiated under the auspices of the Office of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics. It was designed to help close the gap that exists between data needs of policy-makers and available bodies of statistics on junior colleges. The primary purposes of the project were: (1) to ascertain major problems and needs articulated by leaders in the junior college, (2) to determine the availability and quality of data existing in the central records of junior colleges, (3) to identify other important descriptions that can only be obtained directly from students and staff, (4) to assist the Office of Education in determining what criteria should be used to measure and analyze the special needs and performances of junior colleges, and (5) to serve as a first step in the development of a national data bank on junior colleges.

The purpose of the data bank will be twofold: (1) to supply the information needed by administrators, educators, and researchers who are concerned with the evaluation and future development of the community junior college; (2) to provide data for the various federal, regional, and state agencies which are concerned with the problems of policy formation and program development in the junior colleges.

In order to meet its objectives, the project included the following activities:

- (1) Interviews with leaders and experts in the junior college field to obtain their assessment of the objectives, problems, needs, and processes important to the continued development of the junior college and to obtain their perceptions of the quantitative information needed to clarify and assist in dealing with these issues.

- (2) An analytical review of the literature on junior colleges to determine further the issues and variables relevant to the development and evaluation of junior colleges.

- (3) In-depth case studies of 15 different types of junior colleges to assess the dynamics of junior colleges and to determine those variables important to the understanding of these dynamics.

(4) The development, pretesting, and justification of a prototypic Junior College Supplement to the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) system.

(5) The development of a series of measurements and items contained in comprehensive prototypic survey instruments for use of future evaluation research on junior colleges.

Volume I contains the analytic review of the literature on junior colleges. The present Volume II contains the results of the case studies and concomitant surveys, and the administrative interviews; tables and other appendix materials related to Volume II are bound separately in Volume IIA: Technical Appendixes. The measurements and instrumentation derived from the project for future evaluation surveys comprise Volume III. The HEGIS Junior College Supplement has been submitted to the Office of Education separately.

The following staff members at UCLA were on the Advisory Committee for The Study of Junior Colleges and contributed to the initial implementation of the project: Arthur M. Cohen, Associate Professor of Higher Education; Principal Investigator and Director, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges; Richard D. Howe, Assistant Executive Director, League for Innovation in the Community College; Director, UCLA Junior College Leadership Program; and C. Robert Pace, Professor of Higher Education; Director, Higher Education Evaluation Program, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Dr. John Lombardi of UCLA's ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges graciously contributed to the development of the project's interview schedule for administrators. He also chaired the "Santa Fe Revisited" conference which was sponsored by the project to obtain inputs from major leaders of the junior college movement who originally presented their ideas in a series of discussions at Santa Fe College under the coordination of Joseph Fordyce. The participants of this conference are also gratefully acknowledged.

William Keim, former Assistant Superintendent of Community Services, Cerritos College, and current Chairman of the Community Services Committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges, helped in the preparation of instrument items relating to community services. Jane Matson, Professor of Guidance and Counseling, California State University, Los Angeles, assisted The Study of Junior Colleges staff in the development of the counselor questionnaire as well as with the selection of case-study sites. In addition,

two project staff members visited the National Laboratory for Higher Education to discuss matters of sampling and survey techniques and selection of case-study schools with various NLHE staff, and in particular with John Roueche, who was at that time Director of the Junior and Community College Division.

A number of other agencies were likewise consulted, such as the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, whose files were used extensively in preparing the literature review (a major determinant of items included in the survey forms) and the UCLA Survey Research Center which offered suggestions regarding sampling techniques, questionnaire construction, and survey procedures.

A number of experts in the field were most helpful in their review of the HEGIS supplement. These included Dorothy Knoell, Dennis J. Jones, Charles R. Walker, William Morsch, and Edmund Gleazer.

Outstanding supporting staff members included Barbara Vizents, Jan Newmark, Lenois Stovall, Vera Lawley, Janet Katano, Irene Chow, and, most particularly, Lenore Korchek. Jane C. Beer was most helpful in preparing the project's volumes for publication. Winston Doby and Robert Collins graciously assisted with the site visits. Richard Seligman, Associate Director of the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, was most helpful in directing the Center's resources towards the successful completion of the project.

The extensive project could not have been completed without the exceptional talent and commitment of the research staff. These included Patrick Breslin, Barbara Dorf, Robert Fitch (who initiated the early coordination of the project), Ronald Hart, Janet Hoel, Roberta Malmgren, Ann Morey, and Clare Rose. Clarence Bradford and Ricardo Klorman were indispensable in their overseeing the data analyses. Ernest Scalberg was equally indispensable in his direction of the sub-project focussed on the development and pretesting of the HEGIS supplement. Above all, appreciation is extended to Michael Gaffney and Felice Karman who directed the project during its inevitably difficult and complex stages.

James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
CHAPTER 1: Towards Evaluation of Community Colleges	1
CHAPTER 2: Design and Methodology	9
CHAPTER 3: Institutional Profiles	27
CHAPTER 4: Administrative Profiles	37
CHAPTER 5: Student Profiles	75
CHAPTER 6: Faculty Profiles	135
CHAPTER 7: Counselor Profiles	177
CHAPTER 8: Staff and Students: Comparative Perspectives	185
CHAPTER 9: Epilogue	203
REFERENCES	217

NOTE: The Tables and Appendixes referred to in this volume are contained in the separately bound Volume IIA: Technical Appendixes.

CHAPTER 1

TOWARDS EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES *

Need for Evaluation

Increasingly the community college is assuming most of lower division higher education. Many educators and government officials regard it as the primary institution to implement universal higher education, for it has been established by federal decree that all who are capable are to have access to college. This means that the community college more than it ever has before must deal intensely with the lives, careers, and leadership of our coming generations. It means also that the community college must examine itself to assure that it is not only carrying out its mission, but is also doing so in the most effective way possible. Yet the extensive reviews and critiques of the literature by Cross (1968) and Cohen (1969 a,b) indicate a dearth of systematic research and evaluation pertinent to the community college.

Because of the focal role of the community college in higher education, it can no longer afford to go unevaluated as it has. The value and implementation of its functions and objectives must be demonstrated, and, if they are found wanting, a way must be sought for improved implementation of more relevant functions. Community junior colleges cannot be referred to as open-door colleges without qualification. The evidence is that too often they are revolving-door colleges. Junior colleges cannot unequivocally be considered community colleges when they exhibit non-communication with important segments of their communities. Nor can they be accepted entirely as student-centered colleges in the face of continual evidence of heavy attrition among their students, a condition not salutary for many of them.

What is necessary now is an assessment of the nature and impact of the whole system of community colleges, free from prejudgments and preconceptions. Such evaluation involves much more than most of the little

*Portions of this chapter were adapted from a previous publication (Trent, 1970b).

research now done in community colleges, such as counting withdrawals and transfer students, predicting grade point averages from academic aptitude scores (which works for white middle-class students, but probably not for most minority students), preparing for accreditation, or recounting selected successes among graduates, as important as these matters are.

Cases in Point

Berg and Axtell (1968) have provided a landmark study in their investigation of programs for "disadvantaged" students in community colleges. Their comprehensive survey of students and faculty in a representative sample of California community colleges reveals that with very few exceptions, these colleges have done nothing special to recruit minority students or to assist those minority students who have enrolled to meet the expectations of the college. In the meantime Knoell's (1969) recent study of the college-going behavior of urban high school graduates from metropolitan areas about the country indicated that Black students enroll in college in the same proportion as white students of low socioeconomic status, and that talent is going untapped in either instance. Both studies call into question important objectives of the community college in as much as it avowedly serves the total community but in fact may not do so in important ways.

Clearly, an effective program for minority students is not possible on the basis of a special academic program alone. There must exist a supportive, sensitized atmosphere where there is prevalent an understanding of minority students, including their internal conflicts and divergent values. This is not possible if the students are made to conform to the college environment. Rather the environment must be restructured to respond to them. The big remaining question is how to ascertain and develop that type of environment.

The same question is relevant to quite another type of program. One of the major features that Johnson (1969) found in his survey of innovations in community colleges was the use of audio- or auto-tutorial laboratories that provide such materials as single-concept films which students can review on their own. An example Johnson cited is Michigan's Delta College which has developed a remarkable set of single-concept films and a

tutorial laboratory for its nursing students. In 1969 the college held a conference to introduce these materials to representatives from participating institutions in the League for Innovation in Community Colleges.

There was a feeling at the conference that the single-concept films and auto-tutorial laboratory had made a considerable and unique contribution to the learning of the students. The enthusiasm seemed justified, especially in reference to the very articulate and personable students who were present. But it was not apparent just how much difference the films made, if any, compared with other features of the nursing department and institution as a whole.

There existed, for example, faculty-student relations unique for their cordial, candid and communicative interactions, a stress on humanitarian interpersonal relationships, an educational format that included general and small assembly sessions designed to elicit expression and discussion of problems of both an intellectual and personal nature, and a competent, open administration that encouraged the department's efforts.

Very likely it was the particular kind of institutional setting that made possible the sort of learning and living that was apparent at Delta College. It is, therefore, as important to examine the formation of the setting as it is to examine the particular instructional technique.

The issue might be put another way: The research of Berg, Axtell, and Knoell shows the discrepancies that can exist between objectives that are held but which are not actually implemented, and points out directions to follow and evaluate. Programs can be found that appear to be following these directions. But whether the programs are designed to enhance the education of minority students or students at large, at this point they are reaching only a minute number of students. They are also very expensive at a time when higher education is hurting financially.

Programs for educational improvement will and, in many cases, should vary by institution. They should, however, be evaluated so that both their shortcomings--almost never mentioned--and effective features can be determined objectively. Too often what is professed to be program evaluation is only a summary of the impressions of those involved in the program, as was the case with the minority student programs described at the 1969 Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Impression is sometimes helpful to evaluation but seldom sufficient. Systematic research

and evaluation of these programs are essential to identify those principles and techniques that are effective, replicable, and applicable to other institutions at a minimum of expense. To deal with reform properly the research must also consider the implications of the evaluated programs for change on a single campus and for the entire system of higher education. Moreover, the research should consider the implications not just for the next few years, but for many years to follow.

A Beginning Body of Research

Fundamental to systematic evaluation of the community college and its programs is an understanding of the dynamics of the different institutions in the community college system and of the different students who attend these institutions. At present there is no adequate systematic or system-wide information on the impact of the community college or any of its programs on its students or on the broader community it serves. Since 1960, however, there has begun to develop a body of research on the characteristics of community colleges, of their students, and of the outcomes of their programs. The research is relatively comprehensive and sophisticated, especially when compared with research on the community college before 1960. Contributors include: Astin, Panos, and Creager (1966); Baird and Holland (1968); Berg and Axtell (1968); Bushnell and Zagaris (1972); Clark (1960); Godfrey (1969); Hendrix (1969); Hills (1965); Hoyt and Munday (1966); Knoell (1969); Knoell and Medsker (1965); MacMillan (1969 a,b); Medsker and Trent (1965); Panos (1966); Richards and Braskamp (1967); Richards, Rand, and Rand (1965 a,b); Tillery (1964); and Trent and Medsker (1968). Aspects of much of this research have been summarized and synthesized by Cross (1968) and Koos (1970).

The research indicates measurable environmental characteristics of community colleges such as cultural affluence, administrative styles, faculty characteristics, technological orientation, and transfer emphasis that distinguish among community colleges, between community colleges and four-year colleges, and that are somewhat associated with the differential characteristics of students attending diverse community colleges. More is known about the students than about the institutions and what is known is problematical. This is evident from the expanded and updated critical

review of the research which comprises Volume I of The Study of Junior Colleges. Illustrative generalizations contained in Volume I follow, based on comparisons of two- and four-year college students.

Those students who attend community colleges manifest less measured academic aptitude and less academic motivation as exhibited by such factors as the late decision to attend college, lack of interest in being there, and uncertainty about completing their program. They come from a broader, but generally lower, socioeconomic status. They are less introspective, less self-directed toward articulated goals, and less knowledgeable about alternative goals, whether in reference to careers or education; they are, moreover, less likely to realize their goals. They show less interest in ideas and abstractions and are generally less intellectually disposed and less autonomous in their thinking and attitudes; they are also less prone to change on these dimensions. They show less originality, fewer signs of leadership, and less involvement with college extracurricular or community activities. They are much less likely to persist in college beyond two years and are more likely to take longer than four years to obtain their baccalaureate degree if they do transfer to a four-year college. Perhaps more important, there do not appear to be programs or policies numerous or sufficient enough to help students deal with these problems.

The findings summarized are not necessarily negative by implication. More needs to be known about the meaning of these findings and the ultimate attainments and behavior of community college students before such a judgment is warranted. Also community college students are not all of a kind. There is a great deal of diversity among community college student bodies on the traits enumerated, as indicated by the data in the present volume. There is also a great deal of overlap between two- and four-year college students on these same traits.

Suggestions for Evaluation

Regardless of overlapping data, the findings enumerated above are problematical on several counts: (1) they suggest that a number of characteristics shared by many community college students can hinder the realization of the potential of the students, including their potential contribution to

society; (2) they suggest that different characteristics of the colleges can have an impact affecting the traits and outcomes of students; and (3) they suggest the complexity and fluidity of information necessary for appropriate federal, regional, and institutional planning and development of junior colleges.

Community colleges cannot realize their own potential or sufficiently help their diverse students to realize theirs until they have a clear understanding of the dynamics of their various institutional characteristics and programs and the effects of these elements on their students and the larger community. Nor can federal, regional, or state agencies be of optimum assistance in this regard without the same information on a system-wide basis. This entails, in turn, consistent and comprehensive research and evaluation and the establishment of appropriate data banks and statistical centers for the ongoing monitoring of the physical and substantive dynamics and development of junior colleges in relation to other aspects of higher education.

A start in this direction is to determine the criteria that will represent the desired outcomes of the community college. Beginning criteria might well include the realization of student or institutional potential; the attainment of student goals such as ability to transfer to a four-year college, vocational competency, or general knowledge; the attainment of institutional goals such as the development of critical thinking and social awareness among students; or the achievement of the specified behavioral objectives of a program or course.

The demonstration of the criteria may begin with the posing of key questions. For example, does the community college make a difference in the values, attitudes, and attainments of its students? Does it influence different groups of students in the same way, such as those who are unmotivated academically, who are of low or very high academic aptitude, minority students, or those who enter college with vague or unrealistic goals? Does the community college influence all of its students, even those who remain enrolled for only a short time? Or do "successful" students progress in spite of the college? If the college makes a difference, how? And at what financial expense? What critical combination of institutional, faculty, student, and other factors lead to what results? To what extent are the processes leading to certain outcomes generalizable

and replicable for use by others? For the future, what are the most effective strategies to use in the comprehensive evaluation of community colleges?

It is no easy matter to go about answering such mammoth questions, whether by the governmental agency, the institutional research office in the individual community college, or by the university or corporation researcher. From the beginning the researcher must be aware of the many problems in need of research and evaluation. He must also be able to pose them in operational, measurable terms. Although they may be simply stated under three categories, the terms are inevitably interrelated, multiple and complex: (1) They include input variables that reflect important background, aptitude, and dispositional characteristics of students that bear on their education. (2) They include important criteria that reflect outcomes of college attendance. (3) They include a variety of educational and environmental variables, or what may be considered contextual, treatment, or process variables that intervene between students' entrance to and departure from college, and which influence input variables to change in light of specified outcome criteria.

The interrelationship of the elements are the essence of evaluation. More specifically, the objectives of evaluation are: (1) to measure and identify those combinations of input and process factors that contribute to the desired outcome criteria; (2) to provide this information so that educators will have a more knowledgeable basis on which to determine what to change in the system in order to improve the educational experiences for different types of students, again in light of desired outcomes.

The Study of Junior Colleges

The issues, criteria and strategies mentioned above correctly underlie the objectives of The Study of Junior Colleges. The present study was designed to help close the gap that exists between data needs of policy-makers and educators and existing bodies of statistics on junior colleges. The primary purposes of the present project were (1) to describe major characteristics, problems, and needs of junior colleges and their students; (2) to determine the availability of data existing in the central records of junior colleges; (3) to identify other important descriptors that can only be obtained directly from students, and faculty, administra-

tors and counselors; (4) to assist the U.S. Office of Education in determining what criteria should be used to measure and analyze the special needs and performances of junior colleges; and (5) to serve as an initial phase in the development of a national data bank on junior colleges.

The project was not intended to undertake an evaluation of community junior colleges. Rather it was meant to explore a wide range of institutional, student, and faculty variables, as well as their functioning and measurement. The general purpose of the project was to provide an essential step toward delineating the type of research, evaluation, and data needed now and over the next years to plan effectively for the proper functioning of the community college.

Accordingly, Volume I contains a comprehensive analysis of the research to date on junior colleges. The present volume describes the exploratory study of fifteen different types of junior colleges which formed the core of the project. The volume includes an explanation of the study design and methodology; the descriptive surveys of the institutions and their administrators, students, faculty, and counselors; indications of institutional differences on the numerous variables examined through the surveys; and the implications of these data for needed research and development. The tabular material and forms contributing to this volume were so extensive that they have been bound separately as Technical Appendixes to Volume II. Volume III includes a description of the various measurements of predictor and criterion variables derived from multivariate analyses of the survey data; problems that were found with some items; prototypic instruments suggested for future research based on the results of the analysis; and, once again, the implications the data have for future research and development. The prototypic instruments are in addition to the Junior College Supplement that was developed previously in the course of the project for purposes of field testing and subsequent inclusion in the U.S. Office of Education's Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). There remains the great need to analyze the project's data further than was ever possible within the time and funding limits under which the project had to be implemented.

CHAPTER 2

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Advisory Background

The sequence of the project outlined in the conclusion of Chapter 1 began with a point of reference provided by numerous scholars and leaders in the junior college movement. The staff of The Study of Junior Colleges consulted extensively with acknowledged experts in the junior college in all phases of the project's development in order to insure that as many issues as possible pertinent to junior colleges would be covered by the study as well as to obtain recommendations for construction of the instruments, selection of the case-study institutions, sampling procedures, and techniques of data analysis. This procedure was accomplished through individual interviews, through UCLA's Advisory Committee which convened during the early stages of the project, and through inputs from a series of conferences either held by other organizations or sponsored by the project.

Members of the staff of The Study of Junior Colleges attended various conferences on junior colleges in order to poll junior college personnel on issues and problems as well as to obtain feedback to be interpreted in the project's research design. Some of the major conferences were:

National Conference on Junior College Boards of Trustees, University of California, Los Angeles	August 3-5, 1970
Board of Directors' meeting, League for Innovation in the Community College, Seattle	October, 1970
Meetings of the Southern California Institutional Research Association	Fall, 1970
"Santa Fe Revisited", a national conference of junior college leaders sponsored by the project in collaboration with Office of Education, Washington, D.C.	March 3, 1971
California Junior College Association Research and Development Conference, Asilomar, California	May 3-5, 1971

National Conference: Toward Educational
Development in the Community Junior
College

July 16-17, 1971

In addition to meeting with junior college experts and attending various conferences prior to the site visits of the case-study colleges described below, the staff contacted each of the case-study institutions to review with personnel there the objectives of the study, the kinds of information sought, and proposed sampling procedures. Several workshops were helpful prior to the site visits for the purposes of revising the schedules and of refining the interviewing techniques of the project members. A staff member of the Student Counseling Services at UCLA conducted one such workshop; a former president of a major community college assisted at another.

Literature Review

The next step in the development of the study was the preparation of an analysis of literature pertaining to junior colleges. The main purposes of the literature review were:

1. To identify major issues and problems in junior colleges.
2. To isolate areas in need of further research.
3. To provide direction for the development of the survey instruments.
4. To suggest questions to be asked of the data, once collected.

The literature review, comprising Volume I of the study, is divided into 12 chapters focusing on nine areas of interest: major administrative issues and problems, junior college students--a general survey, disadvantaged students and low achievers, relationships with the community, remedial programs, innovations in junior college education, vocational education programs, faculty, and counseling services. Each section presents two types of information: (1) a summary of known information about junior colleges and (2) areas in which research is of questionable quality, in conflict or where it is altogether lacking; in short, areas which are in need of research. The literature review, then, is primarily a critical survey of documents pertaining to junior colleges. It was not intended as an exhaustive work on two-year colleges, but rather attempted to highlight the more crucial issues, describing convergent, divergent, and

interrelated findings, and thus isolating areas where information is needed but data are lacking. Therefore, the perspective chosen for the review was, for the most part, a problems approach.

The Case Study Approach

The basic premise of this approach is that those educational institutions usually subsumed under the rubric of community-junior colleges will, in many important ways, differ one from the other because the criterion variables used to describe, analyze, or evaluate these institutions will be differentially influenced by the particular social and demographic characteristics of the communities served and by the number and range of occupational opportunities present in these communities. It is especially important to recognize this essential fact when attempting, as this study did, to assess the "impact" of community-junior colleges on the students they enroll. To do otherwise--as in the case of national surveys assuming homogeneity among the characteristics of these institutions--is to distort their great strength: elasticity in meeting the different needs of the communities they serve.

In keeping with this premise, the study was designed so that analysis of the survey data would yield information about each case-study institution, and would permit comparative analyses of their "impact" under conditions of statistical control, accounting for the peculiarities of each institution. Due to the limited amount of data available on junior colleges, the study sought to obtain as wide an information base as possible. The study, therefore, was not designed to test hypotheses but was, instead, exploratory in nature. No attempt was made to extrapolate to universe estimates from data obtained in this study. Rather, the case-study approach was applied to 15 junior colleges, each of which was carefully selected according to special criteria of importance to the U.S. Office of Education (enumerated below).

Selection of the Case-Study Colleges

Though the number of colleges included in the sample was small, every effort was made to make the sample as representative as possible.

The selection of institutions was based on enrollment patterns rather than a random sample from a list of schools. Examination of the enrollment figures from the 1970 Junior College Directory (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970) indicated that over 95 percent of the junior college students in the country were enrolled in public junior colleges, even though only about 75 percent of the colleges are public institutions. Over 50 percent of all the junior college students are found in six states that have large populations and many junior colleges. Therefore, the majority of institutions chosen for the sample were public institutions located in the major urban and suburban areas of the large, populous states with many junior colleges. Large junior colleges with comprehensive educational programs are pre-eminent in the sample.

A second major consideration in the selection of the sample was the type of community served by the colleges. One of the major objectives of the study was to determine the extent to which different junior colleges are influenced by the various social and demographic characteristics of the communities they serve and how responsive they are to the needs of the people in those communities. The major variables that were used to select the different kinds of communities included their socioeconomic and ethnic composition, their economy, and whether they were urban, suburban, or rural in nature.

At the request of the Office of Education, only schools that offered occupational programs were included in the sample. Also at the request of the Office of Education, the sample included one private school, one predominantly Black school, and two essentially technical institutions. A list of additional criterion variables, such as school size, age, and type of governance, was developed by the project staff. The final list of variables was then sent to a number of experts on junior college education, who were asked to suggest the names of particular institutions that would meet one or more of the established criteria. Their suggestions were reviewed by the UCLA project staff, and, after consultation with involved personnel of the Office of Education, the final list of colleges was selected.

The final criteria used in the selection of the schools included the following:

1. Geographical region: Since over 50 percent of the country's junior college students are from six states, one case study school was selected from each of these states. These states are California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, and Texas.* Other states which provided regional representation included Missouri, Iowa, North Carolina, and Massachusetts. Because nearly one-third of the nation's junior colleges are in California, three districts from that state were selected; one from the northern and two from the southern part of the state.

2. Type of community: In the selection of the types of communities served by the colleges there was particular concern with the differences between institutions that served large urban communities, suburban communities near the large cities, and communities that contained a rural population and a small or medium sized city. Four of the selected schools serve a rural population, three are inner-city schools, five are suburban, one serves a mixture of inner-city and suburban populations, and another is located in a large intact city. The economy of the areas selected include large industrial centers, agricultural regions, small industrial areas, and commuter-type suburbs. One community also has a large number of military personnel in the district. Attempts were made to include schools located in communities of varying socioeconomic levels, ranging from very low to high. Several colleges are located in districts which include all socioeconomic levels. The sample includes predominantly white communities, predominantly Black communities, communities with a large Mexican-American population, and several communities that are predominantly white but have a large minority population.

3. Age of the institution: Three institutions were selected which were established within the last five years and others that have been in existence for less than ten years. Six of the institutions were established before 1940 and one dates back to 1911.

*One New York school agreed to participate in the study as originally scheduled in Spring, 1971, but subsequently withdrew when the dates of the survey were changed to the following fall. During that fall, several other studies were being conducted on its campus, and it was felt that one more project would be excessive.

4. Size (enrollment): One very small school was selected (enrolling 600 students) as well as three very large schools (enrolling over 10,000 students). The other institutions range from 2000 to 9000 students, with the majority falling in the 2000 to 5000 range.

5. Type of governance: One private institution and 14 public institutions were included in the sample. Among the public schools are institutions that differ in terms of the amount of state control. The institutions selected range from those with almost complete local autonomy to those with very strong state control. The other schools have varying degrees of state control in such areas as finances, curriculum, construction, or personnel policies.

6. Ethnic composition: Over 90 percent of the students in five of the institutions were white. One of the selected institutions was predominantly Black, as noted above. In another institution 40 percent of the students were Mexican-American and 11 percent were Black. In four other institutions, the proportion of Black students ranged from 30 to 47 percent. In the other schools, the proportion of minority students ranged from 10 to 20 percent.

7. Single-campus and multi-campus districts: As noted in the 1970 Junior College Directory, there has been a sharp increase in the number of multi-campus districts in recent years and this trend is expected to continue. Among the sample schools, eight of the institutions were single-campus districts and the others were in multi-campus districts. Multi-campus districts were over-sampled in order to compare inner-city schools with suburban schools in the same area; therefore, two such schools were selected in the same district in three cities. Multi-campus districts also tend to have larger schools and enroll more students.

8. Program emphasis: The primary concern in the area of program emphasis was to select schools which differed in terms of the scope of their occupational programs. One of the schools is a technical institute, and one other enrolls only a few transfer-oriented students. Several of the urban schools enroll a very large proportion of their students in occupational programs, ranging from 35 to 50 percent. Most of the schools would be classified as "comprehensive", where about two-thirds of the students intend to transfer and about one-third are in occupational

programs. Three schools have a strong transfer orientation and offer only a limited number of occupational programs.

Another important dimension in program emphasis is the range of programs offered in the evenings for adults or part-time students. According to data from the institutions, over 50 percent of the students in eight of the institutions were part-time and most of these were enrolled in evening classes. One school has almost no part-time students and in four schools less than one-third of the students were part-time. The schools with a small number of part-time students tend to be transfer-oriented, and more "traditional" and to offer few vocational programs for adults in the evening.

9. Special variables: Special circumstances existed at certain of the institutions which also influenced the decision to include them in the study. For example, two institutions were chosen because one college is private and one is public, and they are both in the same city. Two other institutions were chosen, in part, because of the conflict they have had with various community groups. Such reasons will be noted under the description of each institution outlined below.

A list of the colleges selected for study follows. In each case a few of the major characteristics that influenced their selection are listed. Special features about the institution are also noted. Fictitious names are used in all cases in order to maintain the anonymity of the institutions.

Carter (western city). This college has good occupational and evening programs, but otherwise is quite traditional. Almost 90 percent of its students are white. It is located in a suburban community area, but its students come from broad socioeconomic backgrounds. About 10 percent of Carter's community consists of Mexican-Americans; it also contains one large segment of lower-class whites. The college has virtually no community-oriented programs.

Lowell (western city). This inner-city institution is one of the largest technical junior colleges in the country. It offers a large number of majors, including some transfer programs, and enrolls a large number of Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and adults. Over 60 percent of Lowell's students attend evening classes. Its district is undergoing financial difficulties. Lowell's data base for self-evaluation is weak; and, due to limited funds, it is unable to offer many community service programs.

Appleton and Langston (western city). These colleges are located in a district which has had a great deal of conflict with a variety of well organized community groups, including Black, Mexican-American, women's liberation, and radical political groups. The district has a fairly large number of Black and "disadvantaged" students. It has a good evaluative data base and good research personnel. The district's colleges have limited community service programs although they are responsive to community needs. Langston, an inner-city college, offers more occupational programs and has more minority students than Appleton which is a new, essentially suburban college.

Sherwood (southeastern city). Sherwood's district contains a medium-sized city and rural area (over two counties). This college has an above-average data base, a good research program, and an outstanding counseling program. It is recognized nationally for its innovative and experimental efforts.

Newson (midwestern city). This is a "traditional" college. It is located in a basically rural community and has very few part-time students. Newson is a small but long-established college (1918). Its evaluative data base is weak.

Manning (midwestern city). This college is an inner-city school, with a predominantly Black enrollment. It has an excellent community services program and also offers many special programs for disadvantaged students in its community. In spite of its financial problems, Manning is an innovative and experimental college. It has recently undergone several major changes: the curriculum a few years ago was almost completely a transfer program, but since then the college has added many occupational courses and all areas of the curriculum are now designed to meet the needs of its Black community.

Walden (same city as Manning College). Walden is a predominantly white, suburban college. It enrolls many second generation students of Polish, Italian, and other European nationalities. It has the highest transfer rate of any junior college in the area. Walden, too, faces financial difficulties. The faculty at both Walden and Manning are members of a strong teachers' union.

Quanto and Ward (eastern city). Both of these colleges are located in the same community. Ward is a private college and Quanto is public. In recent years the student enrollment at Ward has decreased, while Quanto's enrollment has increased. Ward recently reported that it is suffering from severe financial problems and has had to cut programs and staff. Both colleges have dormitories. Both also have high tuition fees. Quanto exists in a state which has strong control over its public junior colleges.

Kinsey (midwestern city). Kinsey is a new school, established in 1966. It is located in an intact city but also services surrounding suburban and rural areas. Kinsey's enrollment is increasing rapidly. Its programs are basically "traditional." The college is under local control with some state control.

Foster and Meade (midwestern city). These colleges are in a large multi-campus district. Both institutions are relatively new (1962 and 1964, respectively). They have an excellent data base for evaluation and good research personnel. Foster is an inner-city college and Meade a suburban school. Foster contains a larger percentage of Blacks.

Palmerston (southeastern town). Palmerston is a small, rural technical college with an enrollment of less than 600 students. Its articulation with its community's local industry is outstanding. Palmerston is primarily under state control with some local control. Some members of its local board are appointed by the state.

Shaw (southern city). Shaw is a large college with a large minority student enrollment: over 40 percent of its students are Mexican-American and 11 percent are Black. Although it is located in a large city, it has a limited community program. Shaw is an old, established college under local control. It has a comprehensive curriculum, mostly "traditional"; but it also has made innovative efforts in some areas. Its community contains large numbers of military personnel.

Many characteristics of these institutions are discussed in the following chapter (Institutional Profiles) and are displayed in detail in Appendix A.

Instruments

All the instruments--the three student questionnaires, the faculty questionnaire, the counselor questionnaire, and the administrative interview schedule--evolved from notes taken in the various conferences, discussions with junior college leaders, from the findings of the literature review, and from constant interaction among staff members and experts in the field.

Student Questionnaires

Because of the large number of variables covered in the student survey, the staff felt that asking students to complete all items would impose an unfair burden on them; and, therefore, the items asked of the students were divided into three forms. Some of the most critical questions, however, were included in the beginning of each form. This set of questions, the source of the common data, was concerned with demographic information such as the students' age, sex, race, and socioeconomic status; current educational status and major; educational objectives;

enrollment in remedial courses; reasons for attending college; and grade-point average. The common items also provide data on the students' personality characteristics, specifically those reflecting the students' independence of thinking, intellectual disposition, and level of anxiety.

In addition to the common items, Form A elicited information about the students' financial situation and their work experiences. Form B was concerned with additional information on the students' educational background and status, the influence of others on the students' decision to enter college, their reasons for selecting the particular college, causes and patterns of withdrawal, and three additional personality scales. Measurements of the students' personality characteristics were included in the questionnaires because of the extensive research that indicates that certain aspects of students' personalities are related to their educational achievement. The scales included in Form B were:

1. Internal vs. External Control Scale (Rotter, 1966). Rotter's items were abridged in item 50 for the purposes of this study.
2. Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). All 10 items of this scale were included in item 51.
3. Status-Concern Scale (Kaufman, 1957). All 10 items in the original scale were used in item 52. The central rating column was changed from "Slightly disagree" to "Indifferent."*

Form C asked for information on the students' experiences with and evaluation of both their counseling services and instructors, problems they encountered in college, and their self-rating of their abilities and traits and their rating of their fellow students on the same scales compared to college students generally.

Each form was designed so that the students could complete it in 45 minutes or less. The questionnaires were pretested at a local junior college, where one of the classes used was a remedial English class whose students were able to understand the forms and complete them in 45 minutes. The forms underwent two revisions, and after each revision they were tested again with small numbers of junior-college age subjects to determine whether or not the changes affected the readability or the length of time needed to finish all the items.

*Additional descriptions of these scales may be found in Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes (Robinson and Shaver, 1969).

Faculty Questionnaire

Only one questionnaire was used in the faculty survey. Areas covered in the faculty questionnaire include demographic data (age, sex, race, socioeconomic status of the subjects and their parents); educational and occupational background; instructional and evaluative techniques used by the subjects; satisfaction with their work; their perceptions of their students; their assessment of their college's student personnel services and environments; the benefits that they felt their college provides for their students and communities; their attitudes toward the allocation of administrative responsibilities at their colleges; their attitudes toward their colleges' control over student behavior; their attitudes toward various social issues; and measures of their independence of thinking, intellectual disposition, and level of anxiety. This questionnaire was designed so that it could be completed in less than one hour. Various faculty members with wide experience in the junior college critically reviewed the survey instrument prior to its final revision.

Counselor Questionnaire

In addition to demographic and background items, a special set of questions was developed for counselors to provide data concerning the counseling programs at the 15 colleges, including descriptions of services and major problems. This questionnaire was pretested in the same manner as the faculty form.

Administrative Interviews

Interview schedules were developed for the five principal junior college administrative officers. These included:

1. President or Superintendent
2. Dean of Instruction
3. Dean(s) of Occupational-Vocational Education
4. Dean of Student Personnel Services
5. Fiscal Officer

The interviews were designed to last one to one and one-half hours and were conducted by the project's research staff during the site visits. The questions are mainly qualitative and are concerned with institutional priorities, issues, and problems; fiscal problems; governance; and relations with staff and the community. The anonymous nature of the interviews

was particularly critical because of the small number of persons in each category. Therefore, the respondents were assured that neither they nor their institutions would be identified. The interview schedules underwent six revisions as a result of suggestions made by junior college experts.

Sampling Procedures

Students. Three hundred and fifty students were selected randomly from each of the 15 institutions. Each of 3 forms was administered to one-third of this sample, again at random. The sample was selected by picking every n^{th} name from a roster of students who enrolled in the fall semester or quarter. A random rather than a stratified sample was used because most of the colleges could not provide the necessary information about individual students unless they checked a number of different files by hand. Moreover, in terms of certain key variables, such as income level of students, none of the 15 institutions could furnish the necessary data.

Faculty. The faculty sample was selected by picking every n^{th} name of the faculty from the roster in the school catalogue or from the class schedule. In small colleges that had less than 200 faculty members (both full- and part-time) the sample consisted of two-thirds of the faculty. In medium sized institutions where the number of faculty ranged from 201 to 400 the sample size was half of the staff. In large colleges with over 400 faculty members, the sample size was 15 percent of the staff. The number of faculty contacted at each institution ranged from 38 to 129. The total number of contacts was 1200.

Counselors. All of the counselors at each institution were sent questionnaires. A total of 131 counselor questionnaires were mailed.

Data Collection

After the selection of each college, its president was contacted in order to solicit his cooperation. In most cases, these men designated another administrator to act as liaison between their institution and the

project. The liaison officers helped in such ways as obtaining institutional documents and rosters of students, faculty, and counselors and by arranging for interview appointments with the appropriate administrators. The liaison officers were invaluable to the project in the development and actualization of the site visits and in the collection of needed data.

In describing each case-study college, the project drew upon several data sources: (1) information obtained directly from those involved with the institution; (2) information from the five major administrators interviewed at each school; (3) institutional documents collected from each institution, including accreditation reports, faculty handbooks, and catalogs; and (4) the 1960 and 1970 census reports which provide demographic characteristics of the communities served by the institutions.

Staff members visited 12 of the colleges in November and December, 1971, and 3 in January, 1972. Each site visit was conducted by one researcher and averaged two and a half to three days. As has been indicated above, the primary responsibilities of the site visitor were to interview the administrators and to collect relevant documents and data. In addition, a personal visit to each institution provided a more comprehensive "feel" for the school. Another, albeit unintended, benefit of these site visits was a diplomatic one: the personal visit of a representative of the project fostered greater understanding of the project among the staff members, including the liaison officers, and therefore, it is believed, greater cooperation. In a number of the colleges a description of the site visits appeared in student and faculty bulletins, and it is reasonable to assume that this may have improved response rates.

Questionnaires

At the request of the Office of Education, the faculty, student, and counselor surveys were conducted by mail. In order to preserve the anonymity of the subjects and yet also to maintain accurate lists of non-respondents, the following method was used. Each questionnaire contained a stamped post card with the project's address on it. The subjects were told that when they returned their questionnaires, to return separately the post card on which they should write their name and college. The project staff thereby could check off the incoming names from the original sample meter in order to maintain a current list of non-respondents.

Students. After the student sample had been selected from the colleges' rosters, a record was kept of the name and address of each subject. The first "wave" of student questionnaires was sent to all students between January 11 and February 3, 1972. The reason for such a large time-spread is that one of the participating institutions did not submit a roster of its students from which to choose the sample until late in January.

Each student was sent a packet containing a questionnaire, a return-addressed stamped envelope, a letter from the project director, and a letter from the president of his college requesting his cooperation. Copies of these letters are included in Appendix G. The second wave of the survey began two weeks later. A second letter with another copy of the questionnaire was sent to those students who did not respond to the first wave. Two weeks after this second mailing, a list of non-respondents was compiled and sent to a designated staff member at each of the case-study schools. This person supervised several students, who contacted non-respondents by telephone and urged them to return their questionnaires. The letter sent to these supervisors contains a detailed description of the follow-up procedures, and a copy of it is included in Appendix G. At each institution, three weeks were allowed for this phase, after which time the student lists of non-respondents and unused questionnaires were returned to the project.

To determine whether a relationship existed between student characteristics and the time required for them to return the questionnaire, cross tabulations were performed on selected characteristics by response wave. The selected characteristics were: sex, full- versus part-time status, anticipated occupation, race, size of community in which the student lived, family income, high school and college grade point average, number of units completed, father's and mother's education, reasons for attending college, current job status, number of hours employed per week, day versus evening attendance, importance of college attendance to the student, current major, and father's and mother's occupations.

Difference among the three response groups were generally nominal. There were some exceptions, however. For example, of all students who reported an A average, 72 percent were in the first wave compared to 7 percent in

the third wave; of all the students reporting a D or lower average, 46 percent were in the first wave compared to 20 percent in the third wave. Overall, grade averages declined as response time increased. A considerably larger proportion of the Caucasian and Mexican-American students responded to the first wave than did the Black and Oriental students. In addition, a slightly larger proportion of students of sophomore standing responded to the first wave than did beginning students; a larger proportion of students whose families were in the upper income brackets responded to the first wave than those whose families were in the lower income brackets; and the proportion of first wave students was greater among those to whom college attendance was very important than among those to whom it was of less importance. Otherwise, no real differences were observed and it would seem that students who require one or two reminders before they respond to a questionnaire essentially manifested the same characteristics as the first wave respondents.

Of the 5,250 students comprising the total sample initially, 3,101 returned questionnaires, representing an overall response rate of 59.1 percent. However, because some forms were too incomplete to be of value, the number of usable questionnaires received was 3,078, or 58.6 percent (a respectable rate of return, especially considering the sample of students under study, the fact that the study was conducted by mail, and that it depended entirely upon volunteered responses from the students on their own time).

An important consideration in the analysis of the student data was the extent to which generalizations could be made from the selected sample to the total student body of an institution. Although the respondents were selected randomly, some concern centered around the characteristics of non-respondents; in particular, the determination of whether the non-respondents as a group were similar to the respondents on some basic characteristics--namely, level of father's income and/or occupation, academic achievement (grade average), major field of study (transfer versus occupational), full- or part-time status, ethnicity, and sex. The question became more significant in light of the low response rate of some of the institutions. Three of the 15 schools yielded less than a 50 percent student response.

To examine the characteristics of the non-respondent students on the variables mentioned, a "post-enumeration" check was requested from each school. The sample was drawn randomly from a list of those students who had neglected to return the questionnaire, and a request was sent to the liaison officer at each school to provide the relevant data from their records.

Three schools failed to respond to the request, and some of the institutions were unable to supply some of the data. The data on socioeconomic status (father's occupation or income) was unavailable in some schools' records, as a case in point. Generally, however, the data do appear consistent with expectations based on previous research. Expectations were, for example, that the non-respondents would represent a lower academic standing among students, and this proved to be the case at all the colleges; anticipations also were that there would be fewer full-time students among the non-respondents, and, with the exception of two colleges, this expectation was confirmed; in all but two schools, the majority of non-respondents were in two-year or terminal majors; and in all of the colleges the percentage of racial minorities among the non-respondents exceeded that of the respondents. The data on fathers' income and occupation were too inconclusive or incomplete to permit any general statements about differences between the respondents and non-respondents on these dimensions.

Apparently, therefore, even though the responding students represented a majority of the student bodies surveyed the sample is not without some bias in reference to the student bodies on the whole. Consequently, any statements made about a student body must be considered with caution. Furthermore, these results highlight a major disadvantage of mailed student questionnaires versus those administered directly in the classroom. Unfortunately, circumstances did not permit the latter alternative.

Faculty. The dates of and procedures for the mailing of the faculty survey questionnaires were identical to that of the student survey. Each subject in the faculty sample was sent a questionnaire and a return envelope, as well as a cover letter from the project director and the president of his school. Two weeks later, a letter from the project director

was sent to non-respondents urging them to return the forms. Of 1,232 faculty members in the total sample, 749 returned questionnaires, representing a response rate of 60.8 percent. Of these 749 forms, 743 were usable, making the percentage of usable forms returned 60.3 percent.

Counselors. The procedures for surveying the counselors was the same as for the faculty members. Of the total number of 131 counselors at the 15 institutions, 100, or 76.3 percent returned their questionnaires. Only one form was too incomplete to use.

Administrative Interviews

Most of the interview appointments with the administrators had been arranged prior to the site visit by the liaison officer who distributed a copy of the interview questions to the appropriate administrator in advance. Staff members expected to interview a total of 75 administrators (five administrators at each of the 15 institutions). At four of the colleges, however, the Dean of Instruction also performed the function of Dean of Vocational Education, which resulted in a total of 71 interviews.

The length of interviews varied not only with position (the Fiscal Officer's generally being shorter than the other administrators) but also, of course, by individual. For the most part, however, the interviews lasted between one and one and a half hours. Most of the presidential interviews were taped and later transcribed, while the site visitors merely filled out their questionnaire schedules during the other interviews.

In analyzing the interviews, staff members first established categories for the responses to each question according to the position of the administrator; that is, all presidents, all deans of instruction, etc. After the content categories were established responses were tabulated forming the basis for a summary of the interviews, found in Chapter 4.

Documents

The following documents were either submitted to the project by the liaison officers or were collected by the project's staff when they visited the campuses: Fall, 1971, schedules of classes; 1970-72 catalogs; accreditation reports; 1971-72 faculty and student handbooks; maps of each college's district; and other major institutional reports, such as the

president's annual report. The data from these documents comprise part of the institutional profiles reported in Chapter 3 and Appendix A.

Cleaning and Editing

As the questionnaires were returned, they were coded and the responses were punched on IBM cards and recorded on tape. Those questionnaires that were too incomplete to include were discarded. Editing specifications for cleaning the data were written for each of the five questionnaires (student forms A, B, C, and faculty and counselor questionnaires) by the Survey Research Center at UCLA. These specifications were programmed for the computer and, when submitted with the questionnaire responses, determined which answers were impossible, highly unlikely, or in error due to key-punching as well as any that were inconsistent with other responses in the questionnaire. The errors were corrected, punched, and then resubmitted for data processing. This cleaning process was done several times in order to obtain a final error rate of less than 10 percent on all five questionnaires.

Statistical Analysis

The present volume comprises the descriptive statistics of the various groups surveyed in the 15 colleges. Chi-square values and Tanda coefficients were computed to gain a "first pass" notion of institutional differences in the sequences of the students and faculty. Significant differences ($P \leq .001$) existed among the colleges in their students' and faculties' responses to almost every item. The size of the administrator and counselor samples precluded determining institutional differences for these two groups.

Volume III contains descriptions of the series of multivariate analyses employed to derive various measurements from the data including those "predictors" most associated with important criterion or outcome measures. These analyses, including factor analysis, analysis of variance, regression, and discriminant analysis, formed the major base for selecting the items listed in Volume III recommended for future surveys.

CHAPTER 3

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

In order to gain some insight into the nature of the colleges surveyed, a variety of information was obtained on their characteristics. All but one of the institutions are public, comprehensive community junior colleges. They are highly diverse, however, in almost every other respect on the basis of the variables contained in the institutional profiles.

The profiles comprise Appendix A of the separately bound Technical Appendixes to this volume. They are shown in two forms. The first is a synthesis of the information obtained, so that all 15 colleges surveyed may be compared on any one variable examined. The colleges are classified according to high, middle, and low socioeconomic levels based on such characteristics as the income level of their communities. The parenthetical symbols accompanying the fictitious names of the institutions indicate whether each college enrolls primarily white students (W), mixed white and minority students (M), or primarily Black students (B); also whether the college is located primarily in an urban area (U), an urban-suburban (U-S), a suburban area (S), or a rural area (R). The second form displays more detailed information on each institution separately.

The sources of the profile data and their enumeration follow. Examination must be made of the profiles themselves, however, since full analysis of these extensive data exceeded the confines of this project. The main intent here is to reveal part of the range of information pertinent to the understanding and evaluation of two-year colleges, to point out information gaps, and to indicate the great disparity in the reporting of the data, depending upon their source.

Source of Data

The institutional profiles were compiled from several sources: published institutional documents, including catalogues, accreditation reports, self-studies, and class schedules; 1969-1970 HEGIS records providing data on median achievement test scores, enrollment figures, the

ethnic composition of the student bodies and their communities, advisory boards, and general community data; 1970-71 HEGIS reports; and data obtained directly from school personnel which were not available from the above documents.

Misinterpretation of questionnaire items and partial responses created some difficulty in completing the report, as did discrepancies from the variety of data sources (that is, different documents, as well as records, from different time periods). Some schools of multi-campus districts gave figures for the entire district rather than the specific institution, and where an item response was "No Answer", there was usually no means of determining if records were not kept or were not readily available.

The most productive means of obtaining information from a school appeared to be through direct telephone conversations and interviews which permitted precision in communicating specifically what data were required. However, there is no method of determining the relative accuracy of contradictory figures from various sources. All of the inconsistencies are documented in the profiles, the major ones pertaining to enrollment figures, budget figures, the number of programs in various study areas, and the number of degrees granted.

Profile Data

Description of Institutions' Establishment (Table 3-1)

The oldest college in the sample, Ward, began by offering evening classes at a local community center in 1905. The first bonafide junior colleges, Carter and Newson, were established in 1916. Seven of the colleges began operating in the 1960's. A number of the colleges went through several changes in structure and function, including Manning which changed the emphasis of its programs in 1969 and changed further in nature and name in 1971 in response to student demands.

State Supervisory Agencies (Table 3-2)

All of the institutions but Ward, the private college, are under some form of state control. This control varies from being purely

advisory to direct approval of construction, finances, curricula and programs, admission policies, and tenure. State control in most cases appears extensive enough to be felt by the faculty, many of whom were highly critical of their state governing agencies (see Chapter 6).

Local Supervisory Agencies (Table 3-3)

All of the colleges have a board of trustees, some for their own institution and some for their district. The roles of the board are generally to oversee construction, personnel policies, finances, and student policies. Some also deal with admission policies and staff remuneration. Members of nine of the boards are elected; the state governors appoint the members of three boards, in two cases partially on the basis of recommendations from their state boards of education; in one instance the district board of trustees is appointed by its city's mayor. The board of the private college consists of the members of the board directors of its sponsoring agency plus additional members elected by the board. Many of the faculty of the 15 institutions surveyed were also highly critical of their local boards of trustees, although somewhat less so than they were of their state governing boards.

Budget and Expenditures Per Student (Table 3-4)

Typically the institutions' budgets nearly doubled between 1967 and 1971. The only exception was Ward's, which remained essentially the same. Federal support ranged from 0 to 69 percent of the institutions' budgets, the latter at Lowell, a large trade/technical institution. Most institutions, however, reported that federal funds represented only between 2 to 5 percent of their financial resources. All but four of the institutions reported income from tuition; in several cases the tuition was negligible but in others constituted approximately 25 percent of the institutions' resources. Most of the institutions relied most heavily on state and local funds, with considerable variation in which source predominated. There was also great variation in the institutions' expenditures per student, ranging from approximately \$332 at Quanto to \$1,668 at Palmerston (which reported that federal funds contributed only 0.7 percent of its 1971 budget). A majority of the institutions reported per student expenditures between approximately \$500 to \$800. A great need exists to relate student outcomes to the institutions' expenditures

on their students.

Professional Staff and Student/Staff Ratios (Table 3-5)

The number of full-time equivalent staff varied by institution from 36 at Palmerston to 400 at Shaw. The student/faculty ratios ranged from 15/1 at Meade to 64/1 at Appleton. The number of counselors varied from one at Ward to 18 at Shaw, with 14 each at Foster, Langston, Manning, and Lowell. The range of student/counselor ratios was extensive, from 250/1 at Newson to 1750/1 at Appleton. The student/counselor ratios were over 1000/1 at four of the institutions. Only four of the 15 colleges had student/counselor ratios of 400 or less to 1, the maximum for any real counseling to be possible. These data provide ample evidence for the very small amount of counseling time the students reported receiving at their institutions (see Chapter 5).

Evaluation of Faculty (Table 3-6)

The most prevalent method of faculty evaluation to date is student ratings. Although this method has limitations it can provide a reliable and valid form of evaluation (see Trent and Cohen, in press). The 15 institutions varied a great deal in their reported use of this form of faculty evaluation, but it predominated over any other. Eight of the colleges indicated that evaluation was at the option of their instructors, was entirely informal, or did not exist at all. Two colleges reported formal but unspecified procedures for evaluation, either conducted by the college or district, but presumably precluding systematic student input. The remainder of the colleges used student ratings, in a few cases handled by the students themselves. Where systematic evaluation was reported apparently it was implemented only recently.

Sources of Students (Table 3-7)

Most of the colleges reported a large number of feeder or local high schools, ranging from five at Palmerston to 120 at Foster. Three institutions gave no information on the number of high school graduates in their communities in 1971 and three had no information on the proportions of their graduates that were attending their colleges. The range of the proportion of 1971 high school graduates attending the colleges varied from approximately 11 percent at Newson to 90 percent at Walden. The modal proportion of high school graduates attending the colleges was around 25 percent.

Enrollment Status (Table 3-8)

Ward was the only college to report a decrease in enrollment between 1967 and 1971 as high as 30 percent. Depending on the source of information, Walden reported a decrease of less than 6 percent and Shaw of 11 percent. Again depending upon the source of frequently conflicting information, the range of increase in enrollment for the remaining 12 institutions varied from 12 percent at Foster to 223 percent at Sherwood, followed by 158 percent at Meade. The modal range of increase in enrollment was approximately 30 percent to 70 percent. All the colleges providing information reported having part-time, evening, and special students. Most of the colleges enrolled large proportions of part-time students; at eight of them over 50 percent of the students were part-time.

Program Emphasis (Table 3-9)

All of the colleges reported having a variety of vocational, business, and transfer programs. Most also offered non-credit courses or programs. Most of the business programs included between 2 to 9 majors, the vocational programs between 9 and 42 majors, and the transfer programs between 0 and 51 majors. Generally there were more vocational and business programs reportedly offered than transfer majors, although most of the colleges enrolled more transfer than vocational students.

Students' Academic Aptitude and High School Performance (Table 3-10)

Six of the 15 institutions did not have information on the measured academic aptitude of their students. Four of the colleges had American College Testing Program (ACT) scores and three had College Board (CEEB) scores. One of these colleges had both ACT and CEEB scores for their students. Another college had ACT achievement test scores, one had School and College Ability (SCAT) scores, and one college provided General Army Testing Battery (GATB) and Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT) scores. The mean scores were generally below average compared to college students on the whole, and in some cases considerably below average. Six institutions also could not provide information on their students' high school rank; five of them were among the six that did not report academic aptitude scores. Between 3 percent and 25 percent of the students at the reporting institutions were at the bottom quartile of their high school class in terms of grade point average. Fifty percent of the students at Shaw and, singularly, 81 percent of the students at Sherwood

were ranked in the upper half of their high school class, compared to around 40 percent of the students at most of the other institutions. The achievement level the institutions reported for their students did not appear to depart radically from the achievement reported by the students themselves.

Ethnic Composition (Table 3-11)

Most of the students in the 15 institutions surveyed were Caucasian. However, there were large representations of minority students at Appleton, Langston, Shaw, Sherwood, Lowell, and Palmerston. Manning's students are almost exclusively Black. Institutions such as Foster and Shaw had an underrepresentation of white students compared to the proportion of Caucasians in their communities. There was a great mix of races at Appleton and especially Lowell, which resembled a real ethnic melting pot.

Graduates and Withdrawals (Table 3-12)

For the most part the proportion of June, 1971 graduates who were reported as transferring to four-year colleges outnumbered those who were reported having attained associate degrees. The evidence from the student survey, however, is that there is a great deal--probably a majority--of overlap between the two groups of students. Only at Walden (depending on the source of information), Langston, Carter, and Lowell did as many as 100 students receive certificates. From zero to ten students received certificates at Quanto, Ward, Kinsey, and Manning. All of the figures on the June, 1971 graduates should be examined in reference to the 1971 enrollment figures reported by the 15 institutions as shown in Table 3-8. Especially considering the probable overlap between the transfer and associate degree students, these figures represent very small proportions of the colleges' student bodies, suggesting great slippage of students between entrance and completion of a two-year program. These data, voluminous research on the subject (such as that reported in Volume I of the project), and the status of the students examined in Chapter 5 of this volume all indicate a high attrition for students in the institutions surveyed just as for junior college students generally. Consequently, the small attrition rates reported by the institutions currently and for the last five years are rendered highly

questionable. Considering the importance of this issue the fact that student withdrawal information was not available at eight of the institutions is noteworthy.

Student Financial Aid (Table 3-13)

All of the institutions reported offering financial assistance to their students. The number of programs for this purpose varied from two at Ward to 13 at Lowell. The proportion of the colleges' total budgets devoted to financial aid varied from 1 percent in the Appleton and Langston district to nearly 13 percent at Manning. Most of the institutions reported that between 2 and 7 percent of their budgets was designated for student assistance. The proportions of the student bodies receiving aid varied from less than 5 percent at Walden to 26 percent at Newson. In light of the financial background reported by the students at these colleges (Chapter 5) these figures appear minimal. A great majority of the students reported that they were working while attending college (many of them full time); no doubt a significant number of them had to.

New Majors Added in the Past Five Years (Table 3-14)

The literature and campus and community conversations consistently are the source of questions concerning the relevancy of higher education. One index of a college's response to these questions may be the modification of their curriculum and course offerings. All of the colleges surveyed except Ward reported adding new courses in the last five years. Most of the courses were in vocational programs, followed to some degree by business programs. Four institutions added general education courses, there were no additions in transfer programs. Popular courses had to do with aviation, the paramedical professions, and data processing. There remains the need to evaluate the relevance and efficacy of both the new and established offerings.

Programs for Educationally Disadvantaged Students (Table 3-15)

Four of the colleges provided no information regarding any programs at their institutions designed specifically for educationally disadvantaged students. Several others reported having only general studies or basic skills programs. The other institutions, however, reported having implemented a variety of programs that appear highly innovative and relevant. This was true particularly at Langston, Manning, Carter,

Lowell, and Palmerston. The programs included college readiness, work incentives, pre-career training, neighborhood center training, learning skill centers, English as a second language, tutoring, and an actuation skills center. Four of the colleges reported making no special efforts to recruit disadvantaged students; three of them confined these activities to the efforts of recruitment officers visiting high schools. The rest of the institutions, however, reported additional special recruitment activities. These included sending Black counselors to Black areas; recruitment teams to help students fill out admission forms and to help them solve college entrance problems; financial assistance officers; store front activities; offering work experience to enrolled disadvantaged students through peer recruitment; efforts to reach parolees, discharged servicemen and high school dropouts; a mobile advisory center; community agents, providing buses to bring community members to the campus to acquaint them with the opportunities there; and concerted efforts to locate the disadvantaged in the community. All of the colleges indicated they had financial assistance programs for disadvantaged students. (Appleton did not respond regarding this issue, but presumably was no exception.) The most common programs were the federally supported Work-Study and Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP). A few of the colleges also provided assistance through the Vocational Education Act and state subsidies.

Community Characteristics (Tables 3-16 and 3-17)

There was a paucity of information on the characteristics of the population of the colleges' communities, even though their programs are supposedly designed to meet the needs of their communities. Possibly, the unavailability of 1970 census tract data created difficulties for many institutions in obtaining current, accurate community information. Seven institutions did not report the median educational level of their communities; seven gave no information on the median family income, 11 on the proportions of "white collar" and "blue collar" workers, and five on the percent of the communities' population of college age (18 to 23 years old). The median educational(grade) level reported varied from 9.1 to 12.3, the modal range being from 11 to 12. The reported median family incomes of the communities ranged from \$6,346 (Shaw) to \$15,000 (Ward). None of the low socioeconomic status institutions reported their com-

munities' incomes. The fact that only four institutions reported the proportion of white and blue collar workers in their communities reduces the usefulness of this information. Between 4 (Palmerston) and 31 percent (Sherwood) of the population of the responding institutions' communities was of college age (18-23); the modal range was 5 to 15 percent. The assessed valuation of the colleges' communities varied from approximately 4.5 million dollars to 11.5 billion dollars, with no immediately clear relationship to the other community characteristics, including size, other than in nominal ways. The number of neighboring colleges in the communities varied from one (Shaw) to 30 (Lowell).

Community Services and Involvement (Tables 3-18 to 3-19)

There is immense variation in the proportion of funds that the institutions reported allocating to community services from their total budgets, ranging from none in two cases, through several institutions that allocated a few thousand dollars, or reported obtaining funds from local sources as needed, to allocations approaching 25 percent of the institutions' budgets. There was equal diversity in the quantity and substance of services offered from essentially none in two cases, through confinement to continuing education and/or performances and exhibits open to the public in others, to highly imaginative efforts to provide a variety of educational opportunities related to the communities' needs and interests. Examples of the more special community services include the training of tutors, community ecology, human relations workshops, human and community resources development, community cultural enrichment programs, prison and parole education, store front activities, political awareness programs, drug education, veterans programs, peer counselor training, and ongoing evaluation of community needs. Only two institutions reported not offering off-campus courses. Once again, the range of offerings was great in terms of quantity and substance. Most, however, were career related, although variations existed such as art museum studio courses and a prison annex program. All of the colleges listed advisory boards for their occupational programs, and two had advisory boards for their programs for disadvantaged

students. Four of the colleges had conducted no surveys to determine community needs. Most surveys that were conducted concerned occupational and manpower needs. A few surveys were also made of the needs of disadvantaged students and socioeconomic characteristics of the colleges' communities. One survey was conducted on city survival. All but three of the colleges had an official whose responsibilities were at least in part that of directing the colleges' community services.

Research and Evaluation (Table 3-20)

Six institutions reported having no staff member whose responsibilities included directing or implementing institutional research. The research reported varied considerably from cost analysis and/or "head counting" exclusively to very comprehensive and apparently sophisticated evaluation of whole institutions and their component programs.

The diversity of the institutions in relation to the variables enumerated above highlight the need to relate their characteristics to the student and faculty perceptions and outcomes discussed subsequently. As indicated previously, this was not in the purview of the present project. But, as was stressed in Chapter 1, this type of evaluative research is certainly called for, both on an institutional and national basis.

CHAPTER 4

ADMINISTRATIVE PROFILES

In its attempt to explore the evident range of variables possible pertinent to understanding the functioning and development of junior colleges, the staff of The Study of Junior Colleges began by learning what it could of the perspectives of leaders responsible for the maintenance and new directions of their colleges. Consequently, the project's staff interviewed leaders nationally and the key administrators in the 15 institutions surveyed. Results of these interviews are reviewed in this chapter as they relate to the following topics: (1) philosophy and goals of education, (2) major problems, (3) community relations, (4) counseling services, and (5) relations with state and federal government agencies.

Philosophy of Education in Junior Colleges

Introduction

The junior college, like other social institutions, can be viewed as a system of action. Inherent in every system of social action is a philosophy of purpose, that is, a body of values and goals which the system, ideally, manifests in its operation. In this sense, the philosophy of a social action system performs a crucial function for the system as a whole--to guide, order, and integrate individual and collective behavior. The effectiveness of a philosophical framework in guiding the action of the system depends upon the state of its development. Specifically, performance of the guiding function is enhanced to the degree that the philosophy is (1) explicitly articulated, (2) comprehensive, in the sense of integrating a whole range of related or conjunctive values or goals, (3) internally consistent, and (4) representative of the needs and values of the individuals who comprise the system.

Currently there is a growing concern among some professional educators with what they perceive to be deficiencies within the junior colleges in terms of their operative philosophies. This perspective was evidenced, for example, in the proceedings of the Asilomar conference,

one of a series of recent national conferences of key junior college officials, convened for the purpose of identifying the major educational and administrative problems of these institutions.* The officials in attendance at this conference cited the definition of goals as one of the most critical problems facing the junior colleges. They agreed that the colleges are suffering from operative philosophies which are too poorly defined, too poorly articulated, and too diverse in scope. Consequently, they concluded, the colleges are plagued with a blurred image of what it is they are doing, or attempting to do.

The conclusions reached by the participants of the Asilomar conference are in accord with those of the UCLA Study of Junior Colleges in a review of the recent literature on junior college administration.** A perusal of the current literature suggests two things: first, that the colleges are engaged in a comprehensive effort of self-analysis and evaluation; and second, that this process is, in large part, a programmatic and technical one which is not consistently informed by reference to a more general framework of philosophical ideas. The literature reflects, for example, the concerns of professional educators regarding a variety of specific structural, procedural, and programmatic issues, such as instructional techniques, community service programs, remedial instruction, and optimal organizational patterns. This introspection is a response to the question which seems to be perpetually on the lips of trustees, administrators, counselors, and faculty alike: "How good a job are we doing?" These are obviously issues of great importance to the junior colleges. What is striking about much of this endeavor in

*As indicated in Chapter 2, the staff of the UCLA Study of Junior Colleges monitored the proceedings of the following conferences: 1) California Junior College Association Research and Development Conference, Asilomar, California, May 3-5, 1971; 2) Santa Fe Revisited, held by the Study of Junior Colleges at the Demonstration Center of the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, March 3, 1971; 3) a conference of the Directors of the League of Innovation in Junior Colleges, Seattle, October, 1970; and 4) National Conference on the Junior College Board of Trustees, Sunset Canyon Recreation Center, University of California, Los Angeles, August 3, 1970.

**This literature review comprises Volume I.

self-evaluation, however, is that it does not consistently proceed from a concern with antecedent questions. The question "How good a job are we doing?" cannot be clearly answered without a prior and conscious consideration being given to the question "What is it that we are attempting to achieve?" Thus, reflected in the character of much of the literature is the very problem to which the participants of the Asilomar conference called attention: the lack of a well developed philosophy of education which can guide the thought and action of educators.

This problem was also reflected in the proceedings of other national conferences which the UCLA study monitored. The conference of the Directors of the League of Innovation, for example, addressed itself to the need for self-evaluation in order to improve the effectiveness of the colleges. The Santa Fe Revisited conference dealt with the critical issues of rapid increases in enrollments, fulfillment of the promise of open door education, and the colleges' response to broader social issues in the surrounding communities. The participants of these conferences are to be commended for the serious work and professionalism evidenced in these assemblies. However, the proceedings of the conferences for the most part leave unanswered a basic concern, namely the definition of the goals and philosophy which are to serve as standards in the resolution of these problems.

The Survey

Given the nature of the problem defined in the conferences and the literature, the UCLA Study of Junior Colleges proposed to pursue the issue through interviews with the key officials of the fifteen colleges which participated in the study. Since it is generally assumed that the college presidents occupy the key positions regarding the development and operationalization of educational philosophies within their respective institutions, the interviews solicited, directly and indirectly, the philosophical views of these men. The study proposed to survey not only the specific content of their personal philosophies of education, but also the degree to which the definition of their role as president enabled and encouraged them to perform a leadership function in the development and implementation of those philosophies. Moreover, the study proposed to investigate what procedures exist for input by other

individuals and groups in the college system to the formulation of the college's operative philosophy. The following section of this report is a summary of those findings.

The findings are based on a content analysis of the views expressed by 14 participating presidents.* Their responses to a number of open-ended questions were analyzed for content and grouped according to major idea categories. The findings presented here are not offered as a definitive statement of the nature of operative educational philosophies in junior colleges generally; the small size of the sample does not allow such generalizations. The purpose of the survey, rather, was exploratory. The principal utility of these findings lies in the basis which they provide for further study.

Findings

An analysis of the interview responses of the junior college presidents does not reveal a widespread concern for the definition of educational goals as a primary problem in the achievement of educational aims. When asked what changes they considered necessary for the realization of the goals of higher education, 29 percent (4 of the 14) suggested that the goals and priorities themselves needed first to be more clearly established and/or changed. The majority of the presidents, however, focused on the need for more specific changes, such as in the areas of finance and of administrative, curricular, and instructional reforms. While these latter issues may indirectly imply a concern with philosophical questions, they were not usually expressed within this context. These findings tend to confirm the views of officials at the Asilomar conference.

*Because of scheduling difficulties, one president was unable to be interviewed. In total, presidents from 14 of the 15 institutions in the sample were interviewed. The schedules used in interviewing the presidents and other administrators may be found in Appendix B (in Volume II's separately bound Technical Appendices) preceding the tables referred to in this chapter.

In order to approach the issue of operative philosophies more directly, the presidents were asked what they considered to be the most important goals for post-secondary education in general. Although the responses were quite varied, for the most part they fell into three major idea categories. First, there were a number of responses which defined the aims of higher education in terms of the Personal Development of the individual student, that is, his personal and private growth. These responses emphasized the aim of higher education as being one of making the student more aware of himself and his own needs, interests and potentialities; of helping the student to be more self-accepting; of enhancing his ability to make independent decisions; and of helping the student to develop his own personal schedule of life goals and values. Second, there were a number of responses which stressed the aims of education in terms of the Social Development of the individual student. Like the responses in the first category, those of the second expressed educational aims in terms of the needs of the individual student; however, the responses in the latter category emphasized the development of the student in his social dimension rather than his private dimension. These responses stressed the development of socially useful skills which would allow the student to assess his social environment and to act effectively within it. Finally, there were a number of responses which defined the goals of education from the perspective of the needs of the society as a whole; that is, Societal Development, rather than from the perspective of the needs of the individual student. A more complete description of these goal categories and their sub-classes, and of the distribution of responses among them, is presented below.

I. Personal Development.

- A. Cognitive-Intellectual Development. Twenty-nine percent (4 of the 14 presidents) cited this as a primary aim of higher education. In the words of these men, a principal goal of college instruction is "to teach the student to think critically and analytically," to help him "to learn to think independently," and "to teach students how to learn."

- B. Emotional Development. Forty-three percent (6 of the 14 presidents) cited as a principal goal of higher education the function of facilitating growth in maturity, flexibility, self-understanding, and self-sufficiency on the part of the student. As one respondent stated, a primary aim of the college should be "to provide a sheltered place where students can investigate themselves."
- C. Cultural-Aesthetic Development. One president expressed the view that educational goals should include the development of the student's appreciation of aesthetics and his ability to be aesthetically creative.
- D. Philosophical Development. Twenty-one percent (3 of the 14 presidents) included within their definitions of educational goals the development within the student of a life creed as a standard of personal conduct, and the ability to judge behavior in accordance with ethical principles.

In large measure, the goals included within this major category of Personal Development are conjunctive, that is, they are related, so that development of one may facilitate the development of others. Some presidents gave responses within more than one of these classes and thus reflected a more comprehensively developed educational philosophy in this area. Counting the number of presidents with a response in at least one of the classes of personal development goals, it was found that 57 percent (8 of the 14) viewed this as a major aim of higher education.

II. Social Development

- A. Development of General Social Skills. Thirty-six percent (5 of the 14 presidents) discussed the aims of higher education in terms of the need to assist the individual student in developing his social skills, that is, his ability to understand the perspectives of others and to collaborate effectively with others in the resolution of common problems.
- B. Development of Political Skills. Fourteen percent (2 of the 14 presidents) cited as an important educational goal the development of the student's leadership abilities and his capacity to influence the exercise of power at all levels. This definition of political skills is not restricted to participation in the formal political system, but to all systems of decision-making and social power.

- C. Development of Economic Skills. Fifty-seven percent (8 of the 14 presidents) included within their educational philosophies the development of the student's marketable vocational skills. This goal was mentioned by the presidents more frequently than any other.

Like the goals of the first major category, the goal responses of this Social Development category are to some degree conjunctive. Indeed, it can be seen that there is logically a high level of conjunction among many of the goals of both major categories, in that the development of one enhances the development of others. That some presidents recognized this interrelatedness is reflected in the comprehensiveness of their responses. Counting the number of presidents who gave responses in at least one sub-class of this social development category, it was found that 71 percent (10 of 14) stressed this as a principal aim of higher education.

III. Societal Development.

- A. Citizenship Training. One-half of the presidents (7 of 14) suggested that one of the primary aims of higher education is, in the words of one of them, the formulation of "productive and useful members of society."
- B. Provision of Universal Higher Education. Twenty-nine percent of the presidents (4 of 14) defined as one of the goals of college education the fulfillment of the social need for universal higher education. In this sense, the aim of higher education is seen as the performance of a societal function concomitant with the performance of an instructional function.
- C. Public Service. One president pointed to the performance of services for the surrounding community as a principal aim of higher education.

Societal Development is a residual category. The responses included here are somewhat varied and not necessarily conjunctive among themselves or with goal responses of other categories. Their distinguishing characteristic is that they define educational goals not in terms of the needs and goals of the individual student but rather in terms of the needs and goals of the general public and of the society as a collective entity.

These definitions of educational goals by the presidents and the distribution of their respective responses among the various goal classes provide a basis for some observations regarding the state of development of operative philosophies in the junior colleges. First it is apparent

that in terms of articulation the philosophies of the presidents are reasonably explicit. Their philosophies of education are precise and coherent, at least as they were expressed in the interviews. The extent to which presidents are able to make their philosophies explicit to, and understood by, their administrative and instructional staffs is a matter which will be considered later.

Second, it is evident from the distribution of the presidents' goal responses, as summarized in Table 4-1, that Social Development emerges as the major goal category identified most frequently, with Personal Development and Societal Development being mentioned somewhat less often. The difference in stress among all major goal categories, however, is not very great. They all found wide currency among the presidents.

Third, within the scope of educational goals established by the presidents two distinct philosophical orientations are discernible. One is based on the needs of the individual student; the other on the needs of the community or society. Many of the presidents included both orientations within the scope of their views. It is difficult to ascertain if, and to what extent, these may be mutually inconsistent perspectives. Some commentators suggest that this may be a scope too wide to be optimally effective in the pursuit of either objective.

Finally, the distribution of the presidents' responses offers some insight into the question of the comprehensiveness of their individual operative philosophies. The concept of comprehensiveness, as it is employed here, refers to the relative completeness or fullness of a president's views with respect to a given educational perspective. For example, to measure the comprehensiveness of a president's views with respect to student-oriented educational aims, we can determine what proportion of the total range of student-oriented goals he includes within his framework of educational goals. The seven educational goals included within categories I and II above (Personal Development and Social Development) can be considered as constituting the total range of student-oriented goals. The views of each president are then measured against this standard. The results are shown in Table 4-2. It is evident from the table that many presidents have student-oriented philosophies of rather limited comprehensiveness. One-half of the presidents (7 of 14)

gave responses which stressed only one or less of the educational goals included within the student-oriented range of goals. This would suggest that in terms of stated student-oriented goals, many presidents hold educational philosophies of rather restricted dimensions.

In addition to studying the profile of the stated philosophies of the presidents, the study was interested in investigating the extent to which the role definitions of these men provide, and structure, input to the development and operationalization of an educational philosophy which might serve as a guide to action within the junior colleges. Each president was therefore asked to describe the nature of his office within his respective institution. The responses differed, with a variety of functions being emphasized. Taken together, the responsibilities which they defined represent the major "system functions" which all persisting systems perform. First, there were a number of responses which defined the role of the president in terms of his System Maintenance function. These pointed to the president's responsibilities in the provision and supervision of internal housekeeping services, and the provision and supervision of institutional resources such as instructional and administrative staff, finances, support and management services, and other inputs needed to maintain the operation of the institution. Second, a series of responses emphasized the System Integration function of the president's office. These centered on the president's responsibility to assure that there is internal coordination of effort, and to integrate the actions of the various segments of the college by developing channels of communication. Third, there were those responses which dealt with the president's responsibility to perform a System Adaptation function, that is, the performance of those duties which enable the institution to adapt to the contingencies of its external environment, such as the influx of more students or the evolution of new job demand patterns. These responses focused on the need to make provisions for planning and innovation, as well as the need to adapt the programs and resources of the college to serve the evolving needs of the surrounding community. Finally, there were those responses which stressed the president's role in the establishment of goals, priorities among goals, and the interpretation and operationalization of those goals within the

college. In systemic nomenclature this is the Goal Attainment function. This is the function most germane to our analysis.

These are analytical distinctions among functions. Empirically, of course, a single action may entail the simultaneous performance of more than one system function. These functional categories, however, provide a framework for assessing the nature of the college president's role. Table 4-3 shows the percentage of presidents who included a particular function within the definition of his role. These may be taken as a measure of the individual and relative attention given to the various system functions. It is evident from these data that Goal Attainment, or the "philosophy" function is given considerably less attention than the System Maintenance or the System Adaptation functions. Moreover, the fact that only 28 percent (4 of 14) of the presidents defined their offices in terms of a concern with goals is a telling comment which tends to substantiate the conclusion of the Asilomar conference.

One further area of inquiry regarding the development of operative philosophies was pursued in the presidential interviews. This was the representative nature of the processes by which educational goals are established. Each president was asked how he thought educational goals for college education should be established. Most gave multiple answers. These responses fell principally into two major categories: those which indicated individuals and groups internal to the college as appropriate sources of input (I. Sources Internal to the College), and those which indicated groups from within the community, public agencies, public representatives, or the public in general (II. Community or Public Sources). Within each category are a number of sub-classes of responses. The percentage of presidents who identified each particular sub-class as a proper source of input to the formulation of the goals of the college is shown in Table 4-4.

It is evident from the table that, on the whole, the public sources were endorsed as appropriate more frequently (13 of the 14 presidents) than were sources internal to the college itself (9 of the 14 presidents). Moreover, the sub-class of the General Public is cited by the presidents as a group which should establish the college's goals far more frequently than any other group inside or outside the college. These response distributions indicate that the presidents are especially responsive to the

public will, or at least to what they perceive the public will to be. In the words of one president, educational goals "are public priorities which should be reflected in institutional priorities."

This raises a general question of great importance which should be the basis of further study. Given the predominant position accorded the public will in the establishment of junior college goals, how is this will ascertained? Are there established channels which allow for easy and accurate articulation of various public views and needs? Are the views of trustees and employer groups representative of the will of the community at large? Does the community understand the nature of the college and what it can contribute? In other words, to what degree does the "public will" serve as a viable basis for the establishment of educational goals? These questions cannot be answered on the basis of the interview data of this study. However, as will be noted in subsequent sections of this report, many of the college officials, presidents and deans alike, indicated that contacts between community and college need to be better established.

In comparison with the general public and public entities, the groups internal to the colleges are less frequently cited by the presidents as appropriate contributors in the establishment of educational goals. Only 29 percent (4 of 14) of the presidents, for example, cited the faculty as an appropriate input source in the establishment of educational goals. Some of the presidents expressed the view that teachers should stick to teaching and leave the establishment of educational priorities to the college administration, a view not shared by many of their faculty (see Chapter 6). Some expressed frustration with "activist" faculties which try to determine educational policy. As will be noted in the following section on major problems in the junior colleges, a frequently cited problem among presidents is disagreement with their faculties regarding the operative philosophy of the college. These views raise a question: To what extent is this sector of the college, in fact, represented in the formulation of educational goals; and, in the case of limited faculty participation, what is the effect on the ability of the operative philosophy to serve an integrating and guiding function? This should be identified as a research question of the highest priority.

Attention should also be given to the role which presidents feel the students should play in the establishment of educational goals and priorities. Although 43 percent (6 of 14) of the presidents included students in the list of groups which should contribute to the development of the operative philosophy of the college, the importance of this statistic is diminished by other factors. The channels for student input are, in large measure, poorly developed. Forty-three percent of the presidents indicated that they have little or no contact with students. Most of the remainder revealed that they have only formal contact with student leaders through student council meetings. Some spoke of informal, if sporadic, contact with students in lunchrooms, or suggested that if students had specific complaints that their "door is always open." It would not appear that these structures are well designed to insure the role which many presidents say students should play in the development of the priorities of the educational processes which directly affect them.

Conclusion

Although the interviews of this study were only exploratory in nature, they do indicate the existence of some major problems regarding the state of development of the educational philosophies in the junior colleges. The college presidents, as the key officials in their respective institutions, occupy critical positions with regard to what the operative philosophies of their colleges will be, how they will be formulated, and how they will be implemented. The data presented here suggest that although these men are able to articulate their own views rather precisely, this precision is not consistently applied across a comprehensive range of educational aims. Moreover, the structures of their roles as presidents tend to cast them more in the image of administrators than of educational philosophers. And finally, the processes by which educational goals are established often rely heavily on a public whose will is not always clearly expressed, and often restrict the contribution of important sectors within the college system. If, as the Asilomar conference concluded, the colleges are suffering from a blurred image of what it is they are doing or attempting to do, the causes may well lie in the kinds of problems identified here.

Major Problems of Junior Colleges

Introduction

Because of their unique position in the system of American higher education, junior colleges experience not only the usual range of administrative and educational problems facing the four-year colleges, but are also faced with a series of special problems in such fields as vocational training, remedial instruction, counseling, and community relations. The nature of these kinds of problems is discussed and analyzed in the current literature on junior college administration. These and other common problems have also been identified in a number of national conferences identified above of key junior college officials convened precisely for the purpose of defining and jointly assessing the major problems with which college officials must deal in the operations of their institutions. In order to investigate the nature of these problems in more depth and to ascertain the extent to which the leading national spokesmen have accurately perceived the spectrum of issues confronting presidents, deans, finance officers, and other officers in the day-to-day operations of their colleges, The Study of Junior Colleges proposed to ask these key educators to discuss what they perceive and anticipate as the major problems facing the junior colleges.

The Survey

In extensive open-ended interviews with the presidents, the deans of instruction, the deans of vocational education, and the chief fiscal officers of each of the 15 colleges in the study, these officials were asked a variety of questions designed to elicit their views on several of the major common problem areas identified in the literature and the conferences, as well as to explore problems which have not been widely discussed in these forums. A content analysis was done on the views of each of these officials in order to delineate major trends and to identify areas for further study.

Findings

When the presidents and the deans of instruction were asked to identify from their respective perspectives the major administrative

problems facing their institutions, several recurrent themes emerged. The principal problem areas named by presidents and deans alike were (I. Faculty-Administration Relations), (II. Administration Problems), and (III. Community Relations).

I. Faculty-Administration Relations. Forty-three percent of the presidents (6 of 14) and 13 percent of the deans of instruction (2 of 15) volunteered that relations with the faculty were a major problem facing them. Among these initial comments, the most common complaint was that faculty members resisted control and direction by the top administrative officers, especially with regard to the establishment of the goals and priorities of the college. The presidents and deans felt that there should be more deference to the top administrative officials. As one president said, "to get a commitment to our philosophy is really very difficult." Others expressed the problem more indirectly, citing resistance by the faculty to new ideas, lack of cooperation, or the need to get the faculty to pull together with the administration. Conversely, there were a few officials (1 president and 2 deans) who felt that the faculty was not enough involved in the decision-making processes of the college and should be encouraged to assume a greater responsibility in this regard. This latter view is evidently a minority position.

When asked specifically about problems with respect to their professional staff, however, many of the deans of instruction and the deans of vocational education conceded that they experienced some difficulties. Forty-seven percent of the deans of vocational education (7 of 15), and 53 percent of the deans of instruction (8 of 15) felt that relations between faculty and administration were a major problem at their institutions. Such problems as lack of rapport, resistance to changes and innovations, lack of proper orientation toward the college, and attempts to assert too much control in decision-making were cited in particular. The distribution of these responses is shown in Table 4-5.

II. Administrative Problems. The operational problems cited by the various administrative officers of the junior colleges ran the gamut from recruitment, finances, and the development of the physical facilities of the college, to the need to improve internal communication, clarification of decision-making procedures, and the improvement of efficiency in general.

Recruitment was seen as a major problem by 21 percent of the presidents (3 of 14), by 13 percent of the deans of instruction (2 of 15), and by 20 percent of the deans of vocational education (3 of 15). These responses represent not only the difficulty in finding instructors of sufficient experience in the vocational field, but also of recruiting instructors of ethnic minorities.

Budgetary problems were cited as a major problem more frequently than any other operational issue. Thirty-six percent of the presidents (5 of 14), and 20 percent of the deans of instruction (3 of 15) mentioned this as a major problem. A more detailed view of the financial needs of the institutions was given by the fiscal officers; 60 percent of these officers (9 of 15) identified capital outlay for construction and renovation of facilities as an important problem; 40 percent (6 of 15) cited salaries as a major issue, and 40 percent (6 of 15) also cited the purchase and maintenance of equipment as a major budgetary problem. Other budgetary problems cited less frequently were the provision of new educational programs and funds for in-service training of vocational instructors. The seriousness of the financial problems facing the junior colleges is perhaps better illustrated by the fact that 67 percent of the deans of instruction (10 of 15) and 47 percent of the deans of vocational education (6 of 15) saw finances as among the most critical problems facing the junior colleges in the next five years.

Administrative relationships were also considered as a major problem by a number of top administrators. Thirty-three percent of the deans of instruction (5 of 15), and one president felt that their institutions needed major improvements in the area of internal communication. Many of the deans felt that their staffs needed to be better informed about the operations and problems of the college as a whole. Some cited a serious problem of staff morale and of fractionalized and distrustful staffs due to a holistic perspective of the operation of the college and lack of a well developed system of internal communication to integrate the efforts of the various segments of the administrative staff. The fact that internal communication was cited as a major problem more frequently by deans than by presidents is perhaps a reflection of the fact that in many schools this function is delegated to the second echelon officers. From these and supplemental comments it appears that many of

these officials used the rubric of "internal communications" to refer to what Leland Medsker in the Santa Fe Revisited conference referred to more directly as the lack of a clear understanding of, and commitment to, the purposes and nature of the community college.

Closely related to the problem of internal communication is that of the structuring of decision-making and organizational procedures. Forty percent of the deans of instruction (6 of 15) and two presidents stated that their institutions faced a major problem in this regard. Some felt that decision-making and organizational relationships were not defined clearly enough. Other officials mentioned this problem in terms of the lack of continuity in administrative leadership, or in terms of the need for better trained administrators. These comments are reminiscent of the remarks of one of the participants of the Asilomar conference who was of the opinion that one of the major problems facing the junior colleges was a lack of leadership at all levels. The distribution of responses regarding the major administrative problems is shown in Table 4-6.

III. Community Relations. A third category of major problems mentioned by the chief officers of the selected colleges was that of community relations. Notable about this category, however, is the scarcity of responses within it. Only two of the presidents (14 percent), and two of the deans of instruction (13 percent) included community relations among their major problems. Indeed, as will be discussed in a later section of this report, the majority of the junior college presidents felt that the special relationship between the community and the junior college is one of the unique features and aims of the junior college, and judge their particular institutions to have exceptionally good relations with their respective communities. Indeed, few of the top administrators perceived community relations as a major future problem. However, as the participants of the National Conference on the Junior College Board of Trustees indicated, there is a great need for further study to ascertain to what extent the perceptions of these college officials are supported by objective measures of college-community rapprochement.

There were a variety of other issues which were mentioned by the respondents as constituting major problems in their particular institutions,

but there was insufficient consensus to identify these as characteristic of the junior college in general. A few officials cited student apathy and lack of student participation as a problem. Others cited traditional perspectives and modes of teaching. Two presidents mentioned difficulties in their relationships with the Board of Trustees, but on the other hand five other presidents (36 percent) reported no problems with their Boards.

In addition to identifying the current administrative problems of their colleges, the presidents and deans were also asked to discuss the nature of the problems and changes which they anticipated over the next five years. A perusal of the responses of these officials suggests a difference between the predictions of the presidents and those of the deans. While many of the deans emphasized areas of potential conflict and shortcomings, the presidents tended to respond in terms of positive changes. Over half of the presidents (8 of 14) predicted a notable improvement in the nature and quality of instruction, particularly with regard to increased individualization and flexibility of instruction and comprehensiveness of curricula. The following quotations are typical of some of the responses by the presidents:

There may be a movement toward liberalizing the career programs....

...we will have made some major strides in instructional strategies and will be working with different students at different levels, and will be providing more points of entry for different students.

The basic goals--the humanizing role of education--will not change; however, ways of implementing those goals will.... In time, the community college will be more comprehensive and will be able to serve all the people.

Some foresaw an increased need for vocational training, while others spoke of a change in public attitudes toward consideration of education as a life-long process. These were seen as welcomed and exciting challenges. Perhaps it is the special vantage point which these men enjoy which prompts their generally optimistic view of the future.

This is not to suggest that the presidents are Pollyannas. They did point to a variety of problem areas, such as decreased public support, increased financial difficulties, a lessening of local autonomy, and a possible increase in student and faculty influence at the expense of

administrative authority. These concerns, however, were not widespread, and were voiced by only a few of the presidents.

The deans of instruction and the deans of vocational education, on the other hand, were more guarded in their assessments, and tended to stress the problems, rather than the promise, of the coming years. There was, however, little consensus on the nature of the problems which they anticipated, with the exception of the issue of finances. In the area of budgets, 67 percent of the deans of vocational education (7 of 15) predicted hard times ahead. Some other problem areas mentioned less frequently were those of convincing the faculty of the need for innovativeness in instruction (cited by a total of four deans); synchronization of instructional programs with the needs of the students and community (mentioned by four deans of instruction); recruitment of good students; and the possibility of decreased enrollments.

There were a number of other problems which the various officials felt faced them in the years ahead, but the frequency with which they were cited was not significant and they were so diverse as to defy categorization. One such response, however, we have chosen to report here at length, precisely because the uniqueness of its focus and the forcefulness with which it was expressed may signal a need to devote more research into the funding and structuring of vocational education:

The present rash of government-sponsored so-called occupational programs which currently consume a major portion of the national funds spent on occupational education have been staffed by unqualified administrators and sub-standard instructors. This expenditure, not having had to show results, has had the effect of diverting funds from competent, experienced, vocational efforts to an 'army' of quasi-educators whose chief claim to success has been the enrollment of large numbers of students in classes and who are not aware of the obvious fact that the financial support provided to individual students is the chief reason for the large classes. If these same subsistence funds were provided to students of competent and experienced technical public schools and colleges, the employment record for the money spent would justify the current national expenditure.

It is my major concern that the government in an effort to meet the rapidly escalating need for occupational training is emasculating the efforts of capable training institutions.

In comparing the responses of the various junior college officials interviewed in the study, it was noted that in their assessments of future problems and future needs, the deans of instruction seemed to be differentiated from the other officers in this respect: their responses tended to be somewhat more student-oriented, focusing a large degree of their comments on such issues as the need to develop means to provide for financial assistance to students, to respond to the needs of minority students, to tailor instruction to the needs of the individual students, and to resolve the problems related to high levels of student attrition. The future concerns of the other officials also touched on student-oriented problems, but to lesser degree.

Conclusion

The major problem areas identified most frequently by the presidents and deans interviewed in this study do not necessarily represent all, or even most, of the major problems facing the junior colleges. However, in the view of the officials who are nearest to the administrative firing line in the sample colleges, the issues of administrative-faculty relations, and of internal procedures and decision-making are the most salient. Many of the national authorities on junior college education have concurred with these conclusions through their comments in such forums as national conferences and professional literature. However, the interview respondents of this study do not see community relations as being as problematic as do many of the national spokesmen. This divergence in viewpoints as well as the particular problem areas themselves are areas of study much in need of further research--research placed within a framework of broader questions regarding the ultimate goals and purposes of the junior colleges.

Junior College Community Relations

Introduction

Junior College officials agree that their institutions have a special relationship with the communities in which they are located. An educational program designed to fit the needs of the local community is supposedly one of the distinguishing features of the junior college. Indeed, the junior college is frequently called the community college.

Local governing boards are frequently elected by the voters of the college district. Curricula, especially the vocational offerings, are often developed in collaboration with local employer groups. The colleges commonly offer extensive adult education and general education programs specifically designed to meet the instructional needs of the local denizens, as well as other cultural and public service programs for the local community. In short, the junior college is viewed by many as the educational center of the community.

In order for the colleges to successfully serve the educational needs of their communities, college officials must have a clear understanding of the nature of the local society, must maintain a good rapport with the local residents, and must organize the resources of the college in a manner which serves the disparate educational needs of the various groups in the community. Given the constant flux in the social and economic profiles and dynamics of communities, a junior college is faced with a constant need to re-evaluate its impact on the community. The call for further study into the relationship between college and community is heard repeatedly, both in the professional literature and in the meetings of leading junior college officials. Therefore, The Study of Junior Colleges proposed to pursue this topic in interviews with the presidents and deans of the 15 colleges included within the survey.

The Survey

The issue of community relations was from a variety of perspectives. For example, the college officials were asked what they perceived as the major educational needs of their respective communities, what programs had been instituted by the colleges to meet such needs, what kinds of problems had been encountered in such endeavors, the nature of community response, and areas of needed improvement. The purpose of the interviews was not to determine the factors which would explain the relative success or lack of success of community relations, but simply to identify the salient features of college-community relationships as perceived by the top officials of the colleges.

Findings

That the junior college has a special relationship with the surrounding community is evident in the manner in which college officials define the nature of their institutions. The president of each of the colleges included in this survey were asked what they saw as unique about junior colleges, and where they fit into higher education. One-half (7 of 14) saw the local orientation of the junior college and its responsiveness to local needs as among its distinguishing characteristics. Indeed, 43 percent (6 of 14) defined community service and responsiveness to community needs as one of the principal priorities of the junior college; one president defined public service as one of the most important goals of post-secondary education in general.

Four of the presidents interviewed (29 percent) defined community relations as a major feature of their office, stating that the president is expected to translate the role of the college to the community, to foster cooperation with local business groups, and to be involved generally with all aspects of community life.

The nature of the special relationship between junior colleges and their communities can be seen not only in the impact which the colleges have on the communities, but conversely, in the impact which the communities have on the colleges. As was noted in an earlier section of this report, a large majority of the presidents (10 of 14) perceived the community as among the most appropriate sources for the establishment of the goals of the college, a greater stress than was given to any other group, inside or outside of the college. It is apparent that college officials are very responsive to what they consider to be the will of the community. There is little doubt that the junior college officials in general endorse the nature of the special relationship between their institutions and their communities. Moreover, when the presidents were asked to assess the relative overall success of their relations with the community, 79 percent (11 of 14) rated their efforts as good or excellent; only one president judged the relationship between his college and community as insufficient.

When asked to discuss particular areas of support and particular problem areas in community relations, the presidents gave a variety of

responses. The distribution of these responses is shown in Table 4-7. Two things are evident from these statistics. First, no single area of college-community relationships was seen as either especially good or especially inadequate by a majority of the presidents, and thus no trends can be identified. Second, although a large majority of presidents assessed their overall community relationships as good or excellent, a large number did cite difficulties in specific areas. The picture which evolves from these responses, then, is a mixed one. The problem is compounded somewhat by the fact that much of the assessment is necessarily impressionistic and is not based on rigorous, empirical surveys. There is a great need for the establishment of objective measures of success in all these areas and for periodic assessment of college-community relationships, not only from the perspective of the college but from the perspective of the community as well.

In certain specific areas of college-community relations, the colleges do appear to have developed survey mechanisms which might serve as a basis for assessing community educational needs and for assessing the colleges' efficacy in meeting those needs. For example, deans at 13 of the 15 schools reported that their schools have made studies in the surrounding community to ascertain the job demands and vocational opportunities for their students. Moreover, officials at 10 of the 15 schools reported that they make use of local and state advisory boards for determining the vocational training needs of the community. In this area, then, it appears that the junior colleges have a reasonable basis for evaluating their relations with the community.

In other areas of community relations, however, the informational bases for assessment are not as well developed. Although deans at 9 of the 15 schools stated that their college had undertaken some formal survey of the community, these were typically sporadic or one-time efforts rather than periodic surveys, and were limited to a few issue areas rather than being comprehensive. The deans of 8 of the 15 schools reported that they had access to the findings of formal studies of their communities conducted by other local or state agencies, but such studies are not usually designed for the specific needs of the college.

Most schools simply do not have the facilities to operate their own programs of systematic, ongoing research in the areas of community relations. In the absence of such facilities, many officials rely on more informal informational bases, such as the observations of administrators, trustees, faculty, or other community sources. Such sources were reported as very important in the assessment of community relations at 7 of the 15 schools included in this survey. Moreover, because the colleges do not have well developed community research mechanisms, there is a tendency for the various officials within a given school to utilize different informational bases in the planning of their programs. The responses to interview questions addressed to college officials revealed that within a given college some administrators were apparently unaware of the surveys and other data bases used by their colleagues. It was not uncommon for the dean of vocational education, for example, to report the use of a particular survey, or even no survey data in planning his programs, while his colleague dean of instruction reported the use of other informational bases for his purposes. The possibilities for inconsistency of effort is apparent. One must conclude that there is not only a great need for more systematic surveying of all areas of college-community relations, but also for a more coordinated and systematic use of such information within the colleges.

In addition to the interview inquiries regarding the existence and development of community survey mechanisms, the deans of each college were also asked to identify the major educational needs of their communities. In light of admitted inadequacy of informational bases, the assessment of community needs becomes problematic. Therefore the perceptions of these officials regarding community needs is not presented here as a definitive and objective statement of such needs, either generally or in the particular communities of the colleges included in the study. However, as more systematic means of determining community needs are developed, the perceptions of the deans reported here may serve as a useful comparative base for determining the extent to which current educational and public service programs have in fact coincided with the felt needs of the community. The responses of the deans regarding community educational needs are shown in Table 4-8.

A number of observations can be made from these responses. First, it is apparent that vocational counseling and training emerges as the most frequently cited community need; by contrast, transfer education is cited as a major community need by very few of these officials, in contrast to the faculty's responses. Moreover, as evident from the summary of responses in Table 4-8, a substantial number of deans define as an educational need of the community the modification of public attitudes in favor of vocational training. In view of the large proportion of students who initially enroll in transfer programs, these data suggest that junior college officials either do not accurately perceive the felt educational needs of the community, or define community educational needs in terms other than felt needs.

It is also evident from the responses in Table 4-8 that most junior college officials interviewed viewed community educational needs in terms of, or as falling within, the parameters of existing programs and organizational frameworks. A few, however, extended the scope of community educational needs to include more indirect educational support services such as health service, development of economic opportunities, and development of other community facilities. Although these responses tended to come from officials of colleges located in economically depressed areas, they may signal a growing tendency of junior college officials to define the educational role of the junior college in broader social terms than has previously been the case. The role of the junior college as an agent of community development is an issue of growing debate among college and community officials alike. Some would suggest that the very nature of the community college necessitates a broad definition of its educational role. Others maintain that the inclusion of the college's responsibility is to overextend its resources. This ultimately is a question of educational philosophy which may be informed, but not resolved, by further research.

Inasmuch as community educational needs are defined largely in terms of existing program and organizational patterns, it is not surprising that the responses of the college deans to those needs continue to be formulated largely within these frameworks. In response to the question "What are you doing to meet the community needs?" many deans answered in

terms of existing programs such as remedial instruction, career and transfer education, and adult education. Others cited efforts in the areas of counseling services, and the improvement in the quality of faculty and instruction. Although officials at 5 of the 15 schools indicated that their institutions were making special efforts to increase communications between their colleges and communities and to improve their outreach activities, innovations in programming were reported by deans at only 2 colleges. Apparently the majority of deans see a substantial congruence between community educational needs and existing educational programs, as, for example, the 10 deans of vocational education who viewed most or all of the programs currently offered by their institutions as directly related to the fulfillment of community needs.

This perspective was further reflected in the responses of the deans to a question which sought to ascertain how they would allocate a 20 percent increase in their operating budgets. Out of a total of 30 deans interviewed in the 15 schools, only 3 deans of instruction specifically referred to additional investment in community services; the remainder spoke of allocating the funds for such things as the expansion of existing vocational programs, the expansion and upgrading of the faculty, and the expansion and improvement of the physical plant. The most logical interpretation of these data seems to be, not that the majority of the deans give low priority to community service programs, but that they view current instructional programs as the best means to fulfill the educational needs of the community.

Conclusion

To summarize, the responses of the various officials interviewed in this survey suggest: (1) that there is a strong and sincere commitment to serving the particular educational needs of the college community; (2) that although specific difficulties in college-community relations exist, the overall relationship is perceived by college officials to be good; (3) that the assessment of the educational needs of the community and of the colleges' success in meeting those needs is made difficult by the lack of well developed, systematic and regular surveys; (4) and that the definition of the major educational needs of the community, as well as the development of means to fulfill them, proceeds for the most part within the parameters of traditional programs and structures.

Junior College Counseling Services

Introduction

In the literature on junior college operations, the area of student personnel services appears as a major focus of study. Given the multiplicity of instructional programs offered by the junior colleges and the fact that many students do not have a clear idea regarding their own educational/vocational goals, interests, and abilities, there is an apparent need for guidance and counseling services for these students. Most junior colleges define student counseling as one of their principal educational functions. The questions of the most effective format for such programs, and of the relative success of the colleges in meeting the counseling needs of students, then, become issues of paramount importance.

The Survey

In order to pursue these general questions, staff of The Study of Junior Colleges interviewed the deans of Student Personnel Services at each of the 15 colleges included within the study. The interviews were not designed as objective measures of the impact of the counseling programs, but rather as a survey of what the chief counseling officers regard to be the major issues of their programs. The results reported here are based on a content analysis of the responses of these men.

Findings

Philosophical Orientation of Counseling. The review of the literature on junior college Student Personnel Services which this study undertook concluded that there are essentially two major perspectives which serve as organizing foci for such programs: a humanist ethos which emphasizes the personal growth and development of the individual, and a social ethos which emphasizes the adaptation of the student to the social organization of the college and the world beyond. Although these are not necessarily mutually exclusive operational modes, they do represent differences in orientation. To what extent are these orientations stressed in the operations of specific counseling programs? In order to pursue this question, the deans of Student Personnel Services at each institution were asked to discuss the operative philosophy of their programs.

Two-thirds of the deans (10 of 15) stressed the student growth orientation of their counseling endeavors. This is akin to the humanist ethos identified in the literature. Typical responses of this genre were:

We should provide a sense of oneself as a unique and worthwhile person.

Take the student where he is and accept this....
Don't make his decisions.

I try to get the student to bring out his own alternatives so he can look at them and then make a choice.

A somewhat different orientation was expressed by 53 percent (8 of 15) of the deans. These men reported that their programs emphasize occupational and educational counseling, i.e., the adaption of the student to fill social and economic roles. This orientation corresponds to the social ethos of counseling identified in the literature. It is evident that many counseling programs simultaneously pursue both the humanist and social ethos. Typical of the latter perspective was the response of a college located in an urban milieu:

We believe we must serve the community which created us and we must nourish that community.

Finally, one-fifth of the deans (3 of 15) reported that they adhered to no particular philosophy of counseling, but rather adopted an eclectic and flexible approach.

While the student-oriented, humanist ethos was emphasized by a large majority of the deans, subsequent comments by some of these men brings into question the extent to which such a philosophy is in fact operationalized. While there was an often-repeated concern for the whole student, for his personal growth, and for taking him "where he is," there was concomitantly a widely articulated and adamant aversion to the counseling concerning personal problems. For example, the following kinds of comments followed the initial statement of student-centered counseling:

I try to encourage them (the counselors) to go out and meet the students and get to know them without going into personal counseling.

The counselor is someone who does not stress personal hang-ups.

Perhaps one of the most contradictory responses in this regard was that of a dean who, on the one hand said,

We don't encourage that kind of counseling (personal problems). If someone wants to come in and talk about their problems... I'll listen, but I'm not qualified to treat them.

The same dean followed this comment with the assurance that

We're one of the few services that's always on the student's side. Our main objective is to help the student.

In view of the limited administrative and financial resources of many of the student personnel departments of the junior colleges, and in view of the goal to provide service to the greatest number of students, it is perhaps understandable that comprehensive personal counseling oriented to the individual needs of the students is often more a statement of hope and intent rather than reality. However, limitation of resources was not regularly cited by deans as a reason for the failure to provide such services; rather the feeling seemed to be that "That's not our role." In short, in spite of rhetorical deference to the humanist philosophy of counseling, the reality of many student personnel programs appears to be a traditional effort to adapt the student to meet the requisites of the academic and vocational structures.

Closely related to the issue of philosophy of counseling is the question of the major counseling needs of junior college students. The deans were asked to specify what they felt were the major counseling needs of the students at their college. Eighty-seven percent of the deans (13 of 15) indicated that personal problems and personal development comprised major needs of their students. An equal number of deans cited the need for vocational counseling. Some of the officials stated that many of their students came to college with unrealistic aspirations and that a primary goal of counseling was to help students establish attainable goals. Two other student needs which were identified by a significant number of deans were (1) transfer information, i.e., selection of a four-year college, and (2) financial problems. These two problem areas were discussed by 47 percent of the deans (7 of 15).

Counseling Format. In addition to the work of the regular counseling staff, the deans were asked to comment on the role of the faculty in

the counseling programs at their schools. The implication of much of the literature on junior college counseling suggests the role of the faculty is declining. The responses of the deans did not corroborate this. Eighty-seven percent of the deans (13 of 15) reported that faculty members at their institutions performed some minimal advising functions. The extent of faculty involvement ranged from ad hoc advising on registration questions to participation as counseling associates. Rapport between the faculty and the counseling office was reported as "good" at 7 of the 15 colleges (47 percent).

Four-fifths of the colleges (12 of 15) reported the use of auxiliary personnel, especially peer counselors. The dean of one college with a large proportion of Black students employs 30 peer counselors on his staff and feels that they play an important role. He concluded:

We're finding they are almost indispensable in our kind of setting with our kind of population. With the kind of student body we're dealing with, the really traditionally trained and oriented...counselors are not going to be of enough assistance to us.

On the other hand, as some deans observed, a disadvantage of peer counseling is that students are not in the college long enough to become experienced counselors. One dean voiced opposition to the use of students as counselors, claiming that they dispense more misinformation than correct information. This, however, was a minority viewpoint among the deans.

One trend in Student Personnel Service appears to be an increasing decentralization of counseling programs. Several of the colleges in this study assign counselors to work with specific academic divisions. These counselors often have faculty status within their respective divisions. In addition to the use of faculty counseling associates, decentralization, and peer counseling techniques some colleges are investigating the use of group counseling techniques. One-third of the colleges (3 of 15) reported such programs.

Availability of Counseling Services. The impact of counseling services depends not only on the theoretical orientation of a particular counseling program and the organizational format which it utilizes, but also upon the extent of contact between counseling personnel and students. The deans at each of the colleges were asked to comment on the availability

of counselors in their institutions. Sixty percent of the deans (9 of 15) reported that virtually all of their students saw a counselor at least once due to requirements that new students undergo some initial guidance counseling, or because of freshman orientation courses taught by the counseling staff. Voluntary use of counseling services by students, however, is less common. Two deans, for example, gave figures of 20 and 40 percent of students receiving voluntary counseling excluding financial aid advising. This assessment is reflected in the students' responses reported in Chapter 5. Moreover, a number of deans felt that, although the counseling programs were adequately filling the needs of the full-time day students, they were not meeting the needs of part-time or evening students. Limitation on budgets was given as an explanation of this deficiency.

The student/counselor ratio is another index of the impact potential of a counseling program. Answers to the question of student/counselor ratios, however, did not yield a clear picture. Part of the difficulty in making inter-institutional comparisons is that some schools may have high student/counselor ratios, but offset this by well developed corps of faculty counseling associates. For example, at one school, the student/counselor ratio was 1500/1, but inasmuch as the counseling program was based on a well integrated system of faculty counseling associates each responsible for 50 students, the ratio of students to "counselor" was considerably lower. At another school the ratio of students to full-time counselors was 900/1, but the use of faculty members and para-professional counselor aides decreased the student/"counselor" ratio to 400/1. In absolute terms, the ratios varied from a low of 273/1 to a high of 1500/1. Seven schools gave a student/counselor ratio of between 300/1 and 450/1, while five schools indicated a ratio of between 500/1 and 600/1.

Evaluation. In the review of the literature it was found that systematic evaluation of junior college counseling programs are not well developed in most schools. The issue of evaluation was pursued in the interviews with the deans of Student Personnel Services of the colleges included in this survey. To the inquiry, "Have you any means of evaluating the effectiveness of your counseling program?" 13 of the deans replied in the affirmative. Only one-third (5 of 15) utilized formal

evaluation procedures however. In most cases the evaluations were informal, relying on the "grape-vine" for feedback. A typical response in this regard was the following:

We sample students here and there as to how they feel about the assistance they have received.

At a few schools, students complete questionnaires each quarter assessing the counseling services. While other deans expressed the need for such regularized feedback, lack of funds and resources was cited as an obstacle. As one dean commented,

There is a feeling of effectiveness with the students who come to us...but we have no evaluative surveys; this is our weakness.

The counselors, themselves, also expressed a lack of evaluative feedback (see Chapter 7).

Counselor Qualifications. The deans were also asked about the qualifications for the position of counselor at their school. Eighty percent (12 of 15) noted that formal training, usually a credential in Student Personnel Services or a master's degree in counseling or psychology, is required. Forty-seven percent (7 of 15) also indicated that some prior counseling experience was a requisite for counselors at their school. Forty percent (6 of 15) cited prior teaching experience as a qualification. And 6 deans noted that they look for certain personality traits in their counselors, mainly an ability to relate to the students. In the succinct words of one dean, in order to be hired a potential counselor must express "a real goddamn interest in the kids. That's primary."

Counselor Input to Policy. Because of their special familiarity with students, counselors can contribute important insights to policy-making processes. The extent to which this potential is utilized was one topic of discussion during the interviews with the deans of Student Personnel Services. Fifty-three percent (8 of 15) reported that the counseling staff at their college did have an important impact on the development of curriculum policies, and 60 percent (9 of 15) indicated that counselors at their school served on other administrative committees. Only 20 percent (3 of 15) reported that counselors had no or little input to policy-making processes. This was not the opinion of the counselors, however.

Future Trends in Counseling. The final question addressed to the deans of student personnel services was "What do you see as the major trends in student counseling?" The most frequent response was an increased involvement with the students. This was seen as a trend by two-thirds of the deans (10 of 15). In the future, they maintained, counselors will visit classes more frequently, and make more aggressive outreach efforts. Other trends cited frequently were greater use of para-professionals, especially peer counselors, and an increased use of group counseling techniques. Some of the deans believe that students will need more factual information about vocations and that much of this can be automated, for example, by the use of tape to relay information on vocations and vocational programs. Such a use of technology is seen as freeing counselors from routine duties and enabling them to spend more time on the personal counseling of students.

Conclusion

It is difficult to give an overall picture of junior college counseling programs. The differences between schools is pronounced. In some, the theoretical orientation and operational format of the staff appears to be very traditional. On the other hand, much of the information gathered in interviews with the Deans of Student Personnel Services indicates an attitude of commitment, innovativeness, and professionalism. One senses an aura of dedication to improving the quality of counseling services as well as increasing the scope of such programs. Much effort is still needed, however, in the development of operative philosophies of counseling to guide the various segments of the counseling programs, and there is a need to convey this to counselors, faculty, and para-professional aides. Likewise much effort is needed in the development of procedures for regular and systematic evaluation of the impact of counseling programs. This requires a greater commitment of financial resources. Evaluation of counseling programs needs to be supported not only within each college but on a general comparative basis among colleges as well. Perhaps most important, as long as the student/counselor ratios remain as high as those reported by most of the colleges surveyed, very little real counseling will be possible.

Junior College Relationships with State and National Governmental Agencies

Introduction

Although junior colleges are generally considered to be institutions which are responsive to local needs and wishes, they must also be responsive to influence exerted by agencies of the state and federal governments. The power of the federal government to influence the administration of the junior colleges is largely one of control of vital purse strings; the control of the state governments is typically based on budgetary as well as statutory provisions. How does the exercise of governmental power affect the junior colleges? What are the strengths and weaknesses of such relationships?

The Survey

In pursuit of such questions, the staff interviewed the presidents, deans of instruction, and deans of vocational education at each of the 15 schools. The purpose of the interview questions was not to catalog the various programs through which the colleges are linked to governmental agencies, nor to ascertain precise levels of funding received through various governmental supports. Indeed, spontaneous interviews are not well designed to elicit such detailed and specific information. Rather the aim of the interview questions was to assess in a general and summary fashion, such programs and relationships from the point of view of the men who are most intimately familiar with their consequences at the level of their implementation.

The Findings

Relationships with State Agencies. In the course of the interviews with the college presidents, each was asked to assess, in a general way, the relationships which his college maintains with state agencies. Sixty-four percent (9 of 14) reported that they found state agencies to be generally responsive to the needs of the junior colleges and helpful in the implementation of the colleges' goals. These positive assessments, however, were qualified by the subsequent identification of specific problem areas in these relationships. Forty-three percent of the presidents (6 of 14) were of the opinion that their colleges' relationships

with state agencies were characterized by excessive centralization and control in the hands of the government. In some instances, specific areas of restrictiveness were cited, such as certification requirements, salary schedules, and tuition policies. In contrast, one president perceived a process of decentralization occurring in his state. Some of the specific areas of restrictiveness cited by six of his counterparts were certification requirements, salary schedules, and tuition policies. The following quotes from presidential interviews are included in order to convey something of the tone of the responses.

...the state is moving in a rather alarming direction at a rather alarming speed in terms of state control.

I think that one of our problems in this state is... that the state is actually exercising a much higher degree of control over the operations of the college than it used to.

...I feel in the future we will see more state control. The problems will not come from those offices directly concerned with education but from other state offices such as finance and other non-educational offices.

Apparently much of the faculty shared these concerns; state governing agencies represented the single element about which they expressed the greatest dissatisfaction (Chapter 6).

In addition to the complaints regarding excessive state control, another theme was discernible from the interviews: problems due to the nature of organizational structures and procedures. Forty percent of the presidents (6 of 14) complained of such administrative deficiencies as lack of guidance and coordination by state agencies, unclear definition of the responsibilities of the state entities, bureaucratic red tape, and excessive demands on the colleges in terms of reports and data.

The third major problem area identified by the college presidents was that of finance. One-half of the presidents interviewed (7 of 14) felt that in one way or another the funding procedures adopted by the state agencies discriminated against their institutions. Some felt that the four-year colleges, and even the larger two-year colleges, were favored over the smaller junior colleges. One president complained,

We're the bastards of higher education. We serve more and have the greatest need. But they don't respond to us.

In an overall assessment of state funding, 21 percent of the presidents (3 of 14) judged the amount they received as insufficient, while an equal number felt that in their cases state funds were sufficient. The responses of the remainder provided no direct summary assessment.

Relationships with Federal Agencies. The federal government makes funds available to junior colleges through a variety of programs ranging from student financial aid and funding of particular vocational curricula, to the provision of funds for building classrooms and purchasing equipment. Federal funds are channeled through many different federal agencies, such as the U.S. Office of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Veterans Administration. Funding procedures are also varied: some aid is given in the form of direct grants, some in the form of matching funds, and some funds are restricted to particular kinds of institutions, such as newly developing colleges. The impact of the federal funding programs then is extremely varied, and an overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of federal funding, such as was elicited in the interviews reported here, must necessarily overlook some important specific attributes of such programs. Moreover, the task of assessment is complicated by the fact that in many states a large portion of federal funds are not granted directly to the individual junior colleges, but are channeled first to state agencies which disperse them according among the various colleges according to priorities determined at the state level.

The deans of instruction, deans of vocational education, and chief fiscal officers of each college included within the study were each asked to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the federal programs from the perspective of their particular institution. The single most frequent complaint among the deans was that federal funds were simply too insufficient and sporadic to have a significant and sustained impact on their institutions. A third of the deans of instruction (5 of 15) and a fifth of the deans of vocational education (3 of 15) gave such responses. Among the fiscal officers similar sentiments were expressed: 47 percent (7 of 15) felt that federal funds were either insufficient, or undependable and too short term in their impact.

Another criticism which was often expressed concerned the nature of the procedures involved in the solicitation and administration of federal

funds. Forty-seven percent (7 of 15) of the fiscal officers reported that the administrative efforts required for the receipt and use of federal monies is so great as to make their overall utility questionable. The paperwork required, the complexity of forms, and the demands of periodic reports result in massive administrative costs for the receiving institutions. These sentiments were echoed by one-fifth of all the deans, who felt that federal grant procedures required an excessive amount of their time and resources.

Not only the quantity of administrative requirements but the quality of administrative procedures is seen by junior college officials as a major problem area in federal funding. One-third of the deans of instruction (5 of 15) and one-fifth of the deans of vocational education (3 of 15) pointed to such qualitative limitations as inflexibility in the administration of federal funds, the requirement of advisory committees which are not really useful, and the difficulty in gearing federal programs to local needs. Moreover, two deans and two fiscal officers pointed to the fact that the matching provision of some federal funds discriminates against the poorer schools.

The federal programs do, of course, have their positive dimensions, and junior college officials are not unaware of these. Seven of the 15 fiscal officers emphasized the merits of the federal student financial aid programs which are especially important to low income students. Moreover, as four of the fiscal officers (27 percent) pointed out, federal funding programs stimulate the colleges to expand in needed areas, especially in innovative programs such as auto-tutorial projects. Thirteen percent of the deans interviewed (4 of 30) expressed similar views. Another strength of federal programs cited by the college officials is the support they give to the building and equipment acquisition programs of the colleges. The distribution of responses concerning federal programs from the three groups of college officials is shown in Table 4-9. It is evident from the table that the perceived weaknesses of federal programs substantially outnumber the perceived strengths. Seventy percent of the comments of the deans and 57 percent of the responses of the fiscal officers were negative in content. It is apparent, then, that from the point of view of the college officials federal funding programs are in need of substantial improvement.

Conclusion

As the costs of educational programs expand, the junior colleges find themselves increasingly dependent financially upon state and federal governmental agencies. Financial dependence has also resulted in decreased administrative autonomy, as governmental entities have qualified their support with certain procedural requisites. Although junior college officials recognize the merits and the necessity of such financial relationships, the predominant theme in their assessments of such ties is a negative one. Insufficiency of funds, as well as inflexibility and excessiveness in bureaucratic requirements, prompts college officials to increasingly question the overall utility of such arrangements.

General Conclusion

The interviews with the leading officials of the junior colleges were far ranging and loosely structured in order to allow as much originality, spontaneity, and depth of response as feasible within the outline of the major issues. This format, rather than a highly structured, close-ended questionnaire, was deemed most appropriate to elicit a free flow of ideas on a variety of topics. Indeed, variety is perhaps the best characterization of these interviews. The views summarized in these reports reflect the thinking of many men in different posts within a heterogeneous group of colleges. Given the differences in nature of the colleges included in this survey and the limited size of the sample, it cannot be suggested that these individuals constitute a representative cross-section of junior college officials. On the other hand, however, the inclusion in this survey of a variety of officials from disparate colleges does suggest that the range of issues discussed includes most of the major problems facing the junior colleges today.

These summaries, then, serve at least two major purposes: (1) to identify the range of major problems experienced by junior colleges, and (2) to provide a basis for comparison between the perspectives of the college officials who are daily "on the line", and the perspectives of analysts and other national commentators as expressed in the various

national conferences. A review of the views expressed in the interviews summarized here suggests that there is both congruity and disparity between junior college officials and junior college analysts. It was found, for example, that the views of junior college presidents did substantiate, albeit indirectly, the view of analysts who detect a lack of well articulated educational goals to guide the colleges. Moreover, many of the major administrative problems identified by national analysts, such as faculty/administrative relations, finances, and organizational-procedural problems were verified by the respondents of this study. Likewise the need to improve the quality of instruction, and the need to develop facilities for intramural research, which have been extensively discussed in conferences of leading analysts and commentators, were echoed by the junior college officials involved in the day-to-day operations of the colleges.

Two areas of disparity were notable, however, between the college officials interviewed and the participants of the national conferences. First was the issue of community relations. The general consensus of the conferences was that there exists a great need to improve and expand community programs. The junior college officials, however, did not reflect this concern to a like degree. Although college officials certainly endorse the importance of community services, their overall assessment of their success in this area was generally higher than that of the conference members. Likewise, there appears to be a difference in the views of these two groups of men regarding the issue of open door policy. Many of the speakers at national conferences expressed concern over the number of unreached students. The college officials did not voice this as a major problem with the same frequency or intensity as did the participants of the national conferences. These disparities are themselves of great interest and should be the subject of extensive study.

In summary, the staff of The Study of Junior Colleges were impressed with two themes which seemed to run through many of the interviews. First, a genuine commitment to the continual improvement in the quality of instruction. And secondly, a genuine commitment to the idea of the dignity and worth inherent in the world of work.

CHAPTER 5

STUDENT PROFILES

The source of the survey profiles which follow was the cross-tabulation by institution of each item in the student questionnaires, which allowed for student and institutional comparisons on each question. The commentary emphasizes the statistically significant aspects of the data when comparing institutions; for example, where frequencies at specific institutions are significantly divergent from the mode, or where the response range among institutions seems particularly wide.

Patterns of institutional differences were noted when apparent. Chi square analyses indicated highly significant differences ($p \leq .001$) among institutions in most cases. However, in several instances no pattern was apparent on any single variable or combination of variables. Where unusually high or low proportions of students responded similarly in more than one institution, however, an attempt was made to describe likenesses among the student populations in terms of such variables as socioeconomic status, ethnicity, size, and curricula emphasis. Discussion in the above chapter on methodology pointed out that this was an exploratory study. A great variety of the students' educational, sociological, and attitudinal experiences was explored, resulting in an enormous amount of data. (A very few items, which appeared less important than others or which showed little or no variance, were not developed in the report.)

Important to remember, too, is that this study took a case study approach to the community college. Sample schools were selected on the basis of some unique characteristic. One example is Palmerston, the only trade/technical institution with little or no attention directed to transfer or liberal arts programs. Another is Ward, the only private institution among the 15. Manning is still another, where approximately 98 percent of the students are Black. In view of this institutional uniqueness, it would be inappropriate to attempt any generalization of all junior college students. Although occasionally the comments might seem to imply universality, the intent was stylistic, usually meant to avoid constant repetition of one or two words. For example, the word "students" applies only

to the respondents surveyed.

The responses for the students on the whole for the entire set of questionnaires may be viewed in Appendix C. The data were too extensive to show institutional differences for all items. Some tables, however, were prepared to facilitate presentation of the data -- both the very simple distributions deemed highly relevant and the more complex data where respondents were asked to check a multitude of statements within a single item. For comparative purposes, the institutions were classified according to a high, medium, or low level of socioeconomic status determined by their institutional characteristics (see Chapter 3). The parenthetical codes following the listing of each institution further classifies the institutions accordingly:

1. W: predominantly white enrollment
2. B: predominantly Black enrollment
3. M: mixed enrollment, with large proportions of white and racial minority students
4. S: suburban location
5. U: urban location
6. U-S: urban-suburban location
7. R: rural location

Numbers in the tables vary according to the number of missing responses, or whether the item was submitted to all students, or to one of the three subsamples of students (see Chapter 2).

As also stated earlier, anonymity of schools was an important consideration in this report. Therefore, fictitious names were substituted for the actual names. However, the descriptions of the 15 institutions in the Institutional Profiles (Chapter 3) provide a means of classifying the types of schools embodied in this report considerably beyond the categories and codes contained in the tables.

The findings related to the deliberately wide range of variables incorporated in the Student Survey are summarized below according to the following broad categories:

1. Background characteristics
2. College choice and expectations
3. Educational status
4. Financial status

5. Occupational status and expectations
6. Self-perception and institutional evaluation

The total sample response to all items may be found together with this chapter's tables in Appendix C of the separately bound Technical Appendixes of Volume II.

Background Characteristics

Personal Characteristics

As shown in Table 5-1, 71 percent of the students sampled were between the ages of 16 and 25. However, less than 40 percent were between 16 and 19 years of age, the most common ages of students during their first two years after high school. The majority of the students were in the age range of most senior college students and graduates. Nearly 17 percent of the students were over 30 years old. Schools with the greatest proportion of students from 16 to 25 years of age represented a higher socioeconomic strata (Quanto and Newson), while institutions with the greatest proportion of students over 30 years old, Lowell, Ward, and Carter, represented generally lower socioeconomic strata and inner city or suburban areas.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were male, 42 percent female. Two schools, Lowell, a large school with an emphasis on vocational-technical curricula, and Ward, the private institution also technically oriented, had a disproportionately high number of males, 76 and 83 percent respectively.

Thirty-three percent of the student sample were married, and over 6 percent were divorced or widowed. The outstanding exception among institutions was Ward, a private school, where 72 percent of the respondents were married, and none were divorced (Table 5-2). Of those married, most had at least one child and over 46 percent had 2 or more (Table 5-3). Obviously a great many of the students surveyed had adult family responsibilities going far beyond their roles as students.

Approximately 57 percent of the male respondents never served in the military, and 40 percent were veterans. Three percent were in active service. Twenty-seven percent of the veterans were supported by the G.I. Bill, with the largest proportion (45 percent) found at Foster. Of those who had not served, the largest percentages were at Newson (88 percent), Quanto (80 percent), and Palmerston (72 percent), but no pattern

of institutional characteristics was apparent, although differences among schools were highly significant.

Twenty-six percent of the respondents reported living in large cities; 39 percent were living in suburbs of a large city or a medium sized city; 30 percent were living in a small town; and 5 percent in rural areas. Ninety-four percent of the respondents at Manning and 93 percent at Walden reported living in a large city, compared to 93 percent at Newson and 85 percent at Palmerston who were living in small towns or farm country. At the remainder of the institutions, the distribution among respondents was more diverse but centered more around the suburbs and medium sized cities. In schools with the heaviest enrollment of Black and Mexican-American students, the large majority of students reported living in large cities. In six of the eight schools with predominantly Caucasian enrollments, the majority reported living in smaller cities or small towns.

Although community college students are predominantly commuters, apparently the students in the present sample were not commuting from their parents' homes. Slightly less than half of the students reported living with parents, guardians, or relatives. The next largest proportion (31 percent) lived with spouses, and the remaining lived with friends or alone. The institutional range of students living with their parents was from 20 percent to 88 percent, the lowest proportions being at Sherwood (20 percent), Lowell (27 percent), and Ward (28 percent), and the highest (88 percent) at Quanto, located in a largely white urban area.

The religious background of the students was not entirely expected, as indicated in Table 5-4. Forty-one percent of the respondents were Protestant, 37 percent Catholic, and only 1 percent were Jewish, a higher proportion of Catholics, and smaller proportions of Protestants and Jews than are found nationally. Catholics were particularly disproportionately represented at Walden (68 percent), Quanto (62 percent), Ward (60 percent), and Meade (54 percent), institutions located in areas of the country where there is a considerable overrepresentation of Catholics compared to their proportion of the population nationally. The only schools reporting as many as 3 percent Jewish students were Appleton and Walden. Almost two-thirds of the students at Newson and Palmerston were Protestant. Only 11 percent of the students on the whole reported they had no religion at all, with institutional figures varying from less than 6 percent at Ward, Shaw,

and Palmerston to 21 to 25 percent at Sherwood, Appleton, and Langston. According to the data shown for item 35, Form A of Appendix C, the proportions of religious affiliation among students corresponded closely to those reported for their parents.

The students' racial background appears in Table 5-5. Less than 1 percent of the respondents in all schools were American Indian or Puerto Rican, a little over 1 percent were Oriental, 5 percent were Mexican-American, 16 percent were Black, and 77 percent were Caucasian. In 8 of the 15 institutions, Caucasians predominated by a large majority (at least 82 percent). Only one of these institutions was at the low socioeconomic level whereas over 96 percent of the students at all three of the high socioeconomic institutions were white. Students at Manning were predominantly Black (98 percent), and in Langston and Foster Blacks represented about 41 percent of the responding sample. At Shaw approximately 67 percent of the students were Caucasian, and 28 percent Mexican-American; in the most racially diverse institution, Lowell, approximately 42 percent of the respondents were Caucasian, 31 percent Black, and 18 percent Mexican-American.

Twenty-three percent of the students sampled came from homes where a foreign language was spoken during childhood (Table 5-6). The heterogeneity of nationalities in particular schools seems to reflect the heterogeneity of nationalities in their communities. For example, two schools with a large Mexican-American population were located in cities with a similar ethnic population, as was one with a large proportion of relatively recent European immigrants. These three schools (Shaw, Lowell, and Walden) each had about 40 percent of the respondents reporting a foreign language background. The lowest proportion (10 percent) of foreign language students in any school was at Palmerston, a small rural southern school, and Meade was next with 12 percent. Again, although no pattern was discernible, differences among schools were highly significant.

Overall, considerable diversity in personal characteristics existed among the students surveyed, and this diversity persisted among the institutions they attended. But so, too, is a potentially important pattern discerned: most of the students were not youths just out of high school; many were advanced in years, many had already seen military service, and a great many had marriage and family responsibilities or were living

independently of their parents. They represented different religious-cultural values and races. Many came from second-language homes (and possibly with corresponding educational handicaps).

These facts have major implications for the planning and development of curricula, as well as for the consideration of student financial needs, the time required for program completion, counseling needs, and the extra-curricular activities appropriate to these students. The data also suggest that community colleges are attracting significant numbers of the various cultural components of their communities, again, with attendant implications for the educational programs offered. The situation is further suggested by the following related data on the students' socioeconomic status.

Socioeconomic Status

Major determinants of a student's socioeconomic status are his family's financial, educational, and occupational status and potential as well as his family's cultural and religious values and ethnic background. Combined, these variables greatly determine the individual's position in life, and are highly related to his educational progress. Therefore indicators of all of these variables were included in the survey. As seen in Table 5-7, 67 percent of the students reported that, when they were 17 years old, their families' income was less than \$10,000; 35 percent reported incomes of less than \$6,000 during this time. Considering that nearly 40 percent of the students were between the ages of 16 to 19 years of age, evidently a large proportion of them were living at or close to poverty level.

There were noticeable differences among schools on this variable. In the \$3,000 or less bracket, the range among schools is from 3 to 29 percent, the lowest percentages at this income level attending schools with the smallest proportion of minority students, and the highest percentages in schools with the most minority students. In four of the schools, all with large Black student enrollments, half or more of the respondents reported less than \$6,000 per year income. Students at one institution, Sherwood, on the southeast coast, with a racial composition of 82 percent white and 14 percent Black respondents, reported a high proportion (34 percent) of family income over the \$15,000 per year level; and at another predominately Caucasian school, Meade, 22 percent of the respondents

reported incomes at that level. Other institutions showed considerably fewer students with family incomes that high.

According to these data, there was a large diversity of income levels among institutions, with a high percentage of students from lower income circumstances. As will be seen later in this report, however, a large majority indicated plans to transfer and to continue through college toward advanced degrees. Apparently they expect a radical improvement in their financial situation; failing that, perhaps their plans should be opened to some serious reevaluation, possibly with the assistance of the counseling staff. Otherwise, they may find themselves left with a partial education, not readily saleable in any field.

Forty-three percent of the fathers of respondents were reported to have had less than a high school education, while 11 percent reported attaining a baccalaureate degree or post-graduate education. Institutional differences were statistically significant; three schools of large or pre-dominant Black enrollments, Foster, Palmerston, and Manning, were notably higher in the proportion of students who reported their fathers had less than a high school education; and three, Appleton, Kinsey, and Meade, had proportionately more students whose fathers attained a baccalaureate degree or above.

The overall figures for mothers' education were similar to those for fathers. Proportionately fewer mothers, however, were reported to have graduated from college, but also slightly fewer were reported to have less than a high school diploma. Institutional differences were apparent among schools on the level of mothers' education, but no pattern was evident. Appleton, with 35 percent Black respondents, was singular for having had a higher proportion of fathers and mothers with at least a bachelor's degree than any other school.

The educational level of the students' parents as reported in the present survey corroborates what is known about the socioeconomic status generally among two-year college students. Moreover, this status is low compared to the parental educational level of four-year college and university students, as indicated in Volume I of The Study of Junior Colleges. The same phenomenon is reflected in the occupational levels of the students' parents.

Item 8 of the common form of the student questionnaire (Appendix C) requested the students to clarify each of their parent's occupation (and their expectations about themselves) according to twelve categories when the students were 17 years old. The categories were arranged as much as possible from lowest to highest based on the amount of education, training, skill, and responsibility generally required by occupations in the different categories. Two categories remain apart from this hierarchy, "unemployed" and "housewife"; the middle categories overlap along the criteria considered.

Thirty-two percent of the respondents' fathers were employed in low status occupations, either as unskilled or semi-skilled workers when the students were 17 years old. In the two lowest occupational categories for fathers, the institutional range was from 19 percent at Meade to 73 percent at Manning. The next highest proportion of fathers with unskilled or semi-skilled occupations was found at Lowell, a large inner-city vocational-technical institution on the west coast with a large minority student population.

On the other end of the occupational spectrum were 15 percent of the fathers who were employed either in positions requiring at least a college education or a professional degree, including 2 percent at the highest level, incorporating such occupations as physician, professor, and lawyer. The range at this level was from 3 percent at Manning to 25 percent at Meade. Kinsey, Appleton, Meade, and Carter all reported fathers' occupations at the managerial and professional levels as being higher than the 15 percent reported by the total sample. One of these schools, Appleton, was the only one with a large minority enrollment. The largest proportions of fathers classified in the middle occupational categories were skilled craftsmen or foremen (21 percent) or owner or managers of a small business (11 percent). Only two percent of the fathers were reported to be semi-professionals or technicians.

Although there is a high correlation between income, education, and occupation, this was not found to be consistently the case when examining institutional differences in the present study. That is, schools with a high proportion of students whose fathers had low level occupations were not necessarily the schools whose students reported the lowest income level for their families, or the lowest educational level for

the parents. The exception was at Manning, where students consistently reported depressed levels of educational status, income, and occupations for their families.

A simple majority of the students' mothers (53 percent) reportedly were housewives. Most of the working mothers had semi- or unskilled occupations (20 percent) or skilled clerical occupations (14 percent). The proportions of mothers who had semi- or unskilled occupations varied by institution from 8 percent at Appleton to 44 percent at Manning. Six percent of the students' mothers were employed in positions requiring at least a baccalaureate degree. Institutional differences in the upper level categories were less pronounced for mothers' occupational levels than for fathers'; the range being from 2 to 13 percent.

The diverse but relatively low socioeconomic status of the students continued to be reflected in their report of the cultural interests of their families, indicated by the number of books in their homes. Overall, 40 percent of the students reported less than 50 books; another 20 percent reported 50 to 100 books; and 40 percent reported more than 100. The latter figure included the 16 percent of the students who reported at least 250 books in their homes, quite possibly the minimal indicator of families with real interest in reading books. Institutional differences were not highly significant statistically. But, as expected, generally, schools recruiting low socioeconomic status and/or minority students disproportionately had students with fewer books in the home -- a factor which may have implications for program development for book-oriented courses which predominate in college.

Although the present data are based on selective case studies, like those on parental education, they consistently reflect what is known about junior college students generally, compared to four-year college and university students, again as shown in Volume I of this study. The family backgrounds of a disproportionately large segment of community college students are apparently more circumscribed than those of four-year college students; implying the necessity for more intensive consideration of their educational needs. The judgment here is that the community colleges should be commended for attempting to respond to the challenge of these educational needs.

High School Experience

When asked what type of high school they attended, the students responded that they came predominately from public high schools (85 percent). Eighty-one percent of those sampled attended a regular public high school, the range varying from a high of 97 percent to a low of 54 percent, with no apparent pattern among institutions. Only 4 percent attended a public trade/technical high school, the institutional range among institutions being from 0 to 24 percent.

Twelve percent of the sample attended a Catholic high school. There was no distinct pattern in the distribution of Catholic high school graduates among the various colleges, although Walden and Foster recruited notably high proportions of these students. The data suggest that, unlike past decades, the majority of Catholics in college are not coming from Catholic high schools. This situation is indicated by the large proportion of Catholics in the sample at large, and particularly in certain colleges, discussed under the heading of Personal Characteristics above, which far exceeds the proportion of students from Catholic high schools. (Aspects of this phenomenon have been treated elsewhere; see Trent, 1967.)

Ninety-three percent of the students in the survey had completed high school prior to entering college. The frequency ranged from a high of 100 percent at Newson to a low of 83 percent at Langston. Institutions with the highest proportions of high school graduates were those with predominately white student bodies (Newson, Quanto, and Meade), while those with the lowest proportions had large Black enrollments (Lowell, Manning, and Langston). The students were not attending these colleges in order to gain their high school diplomas, although this has been a traditional service of community colleges. This fact is further corroborated by the students' reasons for attending college, noted in a subsequent section of this report.

Approximately 47 percent of the students had taken general high school courses, the range among schools varying from a high of 67 percent at Foster to a low of 9 percent at Quanto (Table 5-8). Nearly 41 percent of the students had had college preparatory courses in high school with an institutional range of 19 to 73 percent. There was a marked distribution pattern according to the ethnicity of the student bodies: the

highest percentages of students with college preparatory courses attended colleges which predominantly enrolled Caucasian students (Quanto, Carter, and Kinsey), while the lowest percentages attended colleges with a relatively large proportion of Black students (Manning, Foster, and Lowell). Only 4 percent of the students had taken vocational arts high school programs. The largest proportion of students with this background (approximately 15 percent) was at Lowell, a large, vocationally-oriented college with a relatively high proportion of minority students, while the smallest proportions (approximately 1 percent) were at five diverse types of colleges (Quanto, Newson, Foster, Shaw, and Carter). Business and vocational backgrounds were most heavily represented in three colleges: Lowell, Manning, and Ward, the latter a private institution with older, largely male student population. Apparently, then, these community college students were largely public educated, and minority students were disproportionately non-academic in their high school orientations.

Regardless of the students' high school program, relatively few of them entered college with apparent disadvantages in terms of academic achievement. Ninety percent of the students reported having at least a C average and only 9 percent reported less than a C average. Thirty-four percent of the students reported a B average and 5 percent reported an A average. There were no marked differences on this variable between high socioeconomic institutions enrolling predominantly Caucasian students and low socioeconomic institutions with large proportions of minority students.

The students sampled did not appear to participate a great deal in high school extracurricular activities, as indicated by the response rate to item 48, Form B in Appendix C. A majority participated "very much" or "some" in only three of the nine specified activities: sports; music, art, and drama; and miscellaneous academic activities related to their school work. A considerable majority of the students (65 to 88 percent) participated "little or none" in six of the activities: publications, debating, student government, religious groups, social groups such as fraternities, and political groups, the latter having the lowest participation. The two most popular activities were sports and music, art, and drama activities; 27 and 24 percent of the students, respectively, reported participating "very much" in these activities.

Manning students were consistently among the schools with the highest

frequency of participation in high school activities of all kinds; and Palmerston placed in the upper frequencies in a great majority of the categories. Ward most often appeared among the schools with the lowest frequency of participation in these activities.

The majority of the students left their high schools with at least a moderately positive view about the extent they benefited from high school. When asked to indicate whether they benefited "not at all", "some", or "a lot" in six specified areas, at least 70 percent of the students reported benefiting "some" or "a lot" in all areas. In no case, however, did a majority of students feel they benefited "a lot," and approximately 30 percent of the responding students felt they did not benefit at all in four of the six areas: activities in school organizations, athletics, vocational classes, and business classes.

The students responded most positively to classroom learning activities, followed by social activities. More specifically, 52 percent of the students felt that they had derived "some" benefit from classroom learning activities in high school, and 43 percent felt they had benefited "a lot." Conversely, only five percent reported no benefit from such activities. The range of response frequencies was limited, and there was no discernible pattern in the distribution of responses among schools.

Fifty percent of the students reported "some" benefit from high school social activities, and 31 percent reported "a lot." The schools in which the students most frequently reported "a lot" of social benefits were those with relatively small student bodies (Manning, Palmerston, and Newson).

Twenty-nine percent of the students reported no benefits from high school organizational activities, whereas 28 percent reported "a lot." As with social activities, the schools in which students most frequently reported a lot of such high school benefits were those with relatively small student bodies (Palmerston, Sherwood, and Newson). Forty-one percent of the students reported benefiting "some" from high school athletic activities, 31 percent reported benefiting "a lot", and 28 percent "none at all."

Forty-two percent of those who had high school vocational classes reported benefiting "some" from them and 27 percent reported benefiting "a lot." The schools with the higher response frequencies seem to be those with Black student bodies and with strong vocational emphases (Palmerston

and Lowell). Of those who had high school business classes, 44 percent reported "some" benefit from them and 28 percent reported "a lot."

The students at two schools, in particular, were highly consistent in their responses across all areas -- Ward, where a high proportion of the students reported no benefits, and Palmerston, where a high proportion reported "a lot" of benefits in most of the areas. The outstanding differences between these two schools are ethnicity and type of locale, the former being of largely Caucasian enrollment in an urban area, the latter having a large Black enrollment in a rural area.

For the most part the high school experience variables distinguished both among individuals and institutions. No doubt some of the differences found warrant further consideration. An example is the fact that the institutions which enrolled disproportionate number of minority and low socioeconomic students also had disproportionately large numbers of students who had not taken a college preparatory program, in spite of the fact that the majority of these students expressed plans to transfer to a four-year college or university.

But regardless of the diversity found, a dominant student profile again emerges. For the most part the students surveyed came from public high schools where they at least demonstrated average academic performance, most likely in a general education rather than college preparatory program. They were little involved in extra-curricular activities. Yet, although they did not feel they gained a great deal from their classroom and extra-curricular activities they did feel that they benefited from them to some degree. In the vernacular, they did not appear especially "turned on" to their educational experiences, nor "turned off." A major challenge may be to encourage them toward further involvement and interest in their education.

College Choice and Expectations

Aspects of the Decision to Go to College

In response to the question pertaining to the time the respondents decided to attend college, 30 percent did not decide to attend until after graduation from high school (Table 5-9). The frequencies range

from a high of 70 percent to a low of 17 percent. Ward was exceptionally high in this regard. If the anomaly of Ward is disregarded, it appears that the schools with large proportions of Black students had relatively higher percentages of students who decided late to attend college. However, the converse is not necessarily true, that is, those who decided early, or took for granted the decision, to attend college were not found solely among students at schools with low proportions of Black students. Twenty-seven percent of the students reported that they had taken college attendance for granted throughout high school, a smaller figure than is reported in the research on students who attend four-year institutions. These findings are particularly relevant since the later students decide to attend college the less likely they are to persist in college (see Trent and Medsker, 1968).

Of the students sampled, approximately 54 percent said they discussed educational plans and vocational interests with their parents, either "often" or "very often." The persons with whom the students discussed their plans "often" or "very often" are noted in composite Table 5-10 and more definitively in Table 5-11. A notably high response frequency was found among students at Manning. The combined responses for "often" and "very often" ranged from a high of 80 percent to a low of 39 percent. Although there was a wide range of response rates, there was no discernible pattern of institutional differences.

Thirty percent of the students said they had talked "often" or "very often" with counselors regarding their plans, whereas 27 percent reported they had not talked at all with counselors in this regard. Although there seemed to be no pattern in the distribution of responses among schools, over 40 percent of the respondents at some schools checked this variable compared to fewer than 20 percent at others. Considering the important role counselors could play in this regard it seems remarkable that so few students discussed their educational and career plans with them.

Only 25 percent of the students reported talking "often" with teachers regarding their plans. The responses by school ranged from a high of 50 percent at Manning to a low of 13 percent at Meade. Thirty-eight percent of the students reported not talking at all to teachers in this regard. Overall, it appears that those schools with the greatest responses are

schools with large proportions of Black students (Manning, Langston, and Palmerston), while those with the lowest are schools with small proportions of Blacks (Ward, Carter, and Meade).

Only 5 percent of the students reported that they discussed their plans with a minister, rabbi, or priest "often" or "very often." Students at Manning rated comparatively high on this measure. Twenty percent reported that they discussed their plans "often" with their spiritual counselors. Twenty-three percent of the students reported discussing educational plans with other adults either "often" or "very often." The frequencies ranged from a high of 35 percent to a low of 14 percent. Ward was markedly high in this regard but otherwise there was no discernible pattern in the distribution of responses among schools.

Thirty percent of the students reported discussing educational plans with siblings either "often" or "very often." The frequencies range from a high of 54 percent to a low of 16 percent. The response rate at Manning was notably high and, once again, the schools with the highest frequencies were ones with large proportions of Black students (Manning, Langston, Appleton, and Palmerston), while those with the lowest frequencies were ones with small proportions of Black students (Carter, Kinsey, and Ward).

Sixty percent of the students reported that they talked to friends either "often" or "very often" regarding educational plans. The frequencies ranged from a high of 71 percent to a low of 40 percent. There was no obvious pattern in the distribution of responses among schools.

According to these data, students discussed educational and vocational plans more with parents and friends than with any others, including school personnel. Even at Manning, where the highest proportions of students reported seeking counsel about these concerns, only about half reported discussing them with teachers or counselors. Ward, the private institution with a largely adult, male enrollment, was consistently among the schools with the lowest proportion of students who discussed their plans with any of the groups listed in the questionnaire.

Regardless of the amount the students discussed their plans, or with whom, only parents were viewed as having "much" influence on the students' decision to attend college by any great proportion of students. In contrast, a majority of the students felt that their counselors and

teachers had "little or no" influence. This report was in response to the request that the students indicate how much influence parents, counselors, teachers, other adults, and members of their own age group had on their decision to go to college by checking for each group specified whether their influence was "much," "some," "little or none" (item 39 (a), Form B).

Forty-five percent of the students reported that their parents had had a great deal of influence on their decision to attend college, while 26 percent reported no parental influence. The lowest proportion of students (49 percent) claiming no parental influence on this decision was at Ward.

Fifty-six percent of the responding students reported that counselors had had "little or no" influence on their decision to attend college, varying from a high of 75 percent at Sherwood with a large Mexican-American enrollment to a low of 30 percent at Manning with a predominately Black enrollment. Only 12 percent of the respondents at all schools reported that counselors had had much influence in this regard, a finding which corresponds to the small numbers who discussed their educational and career plans with counselors.

Over half of the students (52 percent) reported that their teachers had had "little or no" influence on their decision to attend college, while only 13 percent said that their teachers had had "much" influence in this regard. The range of those reporting "little or no" influence from teachers was highest at Ward (73 percent) and lowest at Manning (27 percent). However, there was no discernible pattern in the distribution of responses among colleges.

Only 16 percent of the students reported that other adults had had "much" influence on their decision to attend college, while 44 percent reported that other adults influenced them in this regard "very little" or "not at all." Although the pattern is not totally consistent, it would appear that other adults have a greater influence on students at schools with large proportions of Black students, and relatively less influence on the students at schools with predominately white students.

Twenty-five percent of the students reported that members of their own age group had had a great deal of influence on their decision to attend college, while 32 percent said that they had been influenced very little or not at all by peers. Institutional differences were nominal in

in this respect.

The students were also asked to indicate which of their groups had the most influence on their decision to attend college (part B of item 39, Form B). Twenty-four percent of the students failed to respond to this question, perhaps because they were uncertain about the matter. The students who did respond, however, indicated that their parents, above all, were most influential.

As shown in Table 5-12, 52 percent of the responding students said that their parents were the most important persons in their decision to attend college. The range of response rates ran from a high of 64 percent at Newson to a low of 22 percent at Ward. This finding is not surprising in view of the fact that Newson is characterized by a particularly young student body, whereas the enrollment at Ward consists largely of older, male students. The group mentioned second most frequently in this regard were peers (23 percent), followed by other adults (13 percent), counselors (6 percent), and teachers (6 percent).

These current findings reflect those of more extensive previous research (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Trent, 1970; Trent & Medsker, 1968). Parents play a dominant role in students' decisions about their education and educational progress. Peers play a secondary role, and teachers and counselors a relatively minor role, as perceived by students. Of course, school personnel may be more influential than students realize, but they may also have the potential of exerting positive influences not presently realized.

By association, peer influence on college attendance was indicated another way by the students sampled, although not to the extent shown by four-year college and university students. When asked how many high school friends went to college, 49 percent of the students reported that most or nearly all of their friends went to college (Table 5-13). The frequencies varied from a high of 70 percent (Newson) to a low of 31 percent (Langston). Only 15 percent reported that very few of their friends had attended college. Students at schools with large proportions of Black students most frequently said that very few of their friends attended college (Lowell, Langston, and Appleton), while students who gave this response least frequently were found in schools with predominately white student bodies (Kinsey, Quanto, and Newson).

Even though most of the students surveyed reported at least some friends attending college, the fact that less than half of the students reported most of their friends attending college in contrast to a predominance of four-year college students, most of whose friends attend college, suggests that junior college students may have less peer reinforcement to go to college compared to senior college students. This, in turn, may be related to the striking difference in withdrawal rates between the two groups of students.

Reasons for Going to College

All students were asked their reasons for attending college, their educational objectives at their particular college, and their ultimate educational objectives. The students in one of the subsamples were asked to indicate the reasons they chose to attend their own college over others.

As indicated in Table 5-16 discussed below, when students were asked about their educational objectives vocational preparation did not seem to be predominant, perhaps because this objective was masked by the alternate to transfer to a four-year college. However, as shown in Table 5-14, when students were asked what their most important reason was for attending college, 70 percent indicated that it was for vocational training, either training for a job (34 percent) or to enter a business career (36 percent). Relatively few students were concerned about obtaining a liberal education (9 percent); about developing their knowledge and interest in community affairs (5 percent); or their own personal enjoyment and enrichment (5 percent). Only 1 percent of the students checked that their main reason for attending college was because their families wanted them to, their employers requested it, or to make up high school deficiencies. None of the students checked that their main reason for attending college was for the social life, for the athletics, to take part in student government or activities, or to be with their friends.

Although the differences among institutions were statistically significant, the students' reasons for attending college appeared much more alike than distinct across colleges, given the large sample and great amount of reasons specified. The greatest institutional differences on

response rates, by far, were in reference to obtaining skills and training for a job. The proportions of students checking this as their most important reason for attending college ranged from approximately 19 percent at Sherwood to 64 percent at Palmerston. But even on this item the modal response rates approximated the total student response rate of some 34 percent.

As indicated by the figures shown for common item 27 in Appendix C, proportionately more students gave as their second most important reason for attending college the obtaining of a liberal education (18 percent) or developing knowledge of community and world affairs (14 percent) than was the case for their first reason for attending college. However, the largest proportion (44 percent) stated as their second most important reason for attending college, vocational training, which was consistent with the main reason given. Institutional differences were statistically significant but the pattern of differences was difficult to ascertain.

Nineteen percent of the students failed to list a third most important reason for attending college. Of those students that did, the largest proportions checked the attainment of a liberal education (21 percent), to develop their knowledge of community and world affairs (18 percent), or for their personal enjoyment and enrichment (16 percent).

The findings indicate that the students were attending college primarily for vocational purposes, but that an observable minority of students saw components of general education as secondary and tertiary reasons for their attending college.

Three factors predominated when a subsample of students were asked to indicate the most important for their choosing their particular college (Table 5-15): low cost (29 percent), the fact that the particular courses they wanted were offered there (27 percent), and the fact that the college was close to home (20 percent). Eight percent of the students indicated that their primary reason for entering their particular college was to improve their grades so that they could transfer to a four-year college. Another 3 percent indicated that it was the only school that they could get into because of low grades. No more than 1 percent of the students responded to any of the other specified reasons.

The low cost, the particularly courses offered, and closeness to home continued to predominate as the three most important reasons the students gave for attending their own college. Institutional differences were significant, but, as usual with these data, no clear pattern emerged. For example, Lowell had next to the lowest proportion of students (approximately 9 percent) who reported low cost as the main reason they attended their particular college; yet Manning had the highest proportion (nearly 50 percent). This difference existed even though both were low socioeconomic institutions. Conversely, over 39 percent of the students at Meade and Quanto, two of the three high socioeconomic schools, gave the low cost as their main reason for choosing their own college, compared to approximately 29 percent of the sample at large.

Lowell was singular for its low proportion of students (less than 6 percent) who gave closeness to home as their main reason for attending college. Lowell was also singular for having the highest proportion of students (approximately 64 percent) primarily because of the courses offered. Of course these findings no doubt occurred because of the trade/technical emphasis of the institutions which likely also accounts for such a high proportion of students at Palmerston (over 58 percent) and Ward (nearly 51 percent) attending their college mainly because of the courses offered. Another factor in the case of Ward's students, as observed previously, is that they were generally men attending night classes. These institutions are exceptional, however, for their readily interpretable uniqueness.

For whatever reason, Walden was exceptional for its disproportionate number of students attending their college mainly to improve their grades to transfer or because it was the only college they could get into because of their low grades. The "salvaging" function is important in community colleges, and is openly desired by a number of students at Walden. The question remains as to the effectiveness of this function.

Educational Objectives

All of the students were asked to indicate their educational objectives both at their institution and ultimately. As shown in Table 5-16,

approximately 61 percent expressed plans to transfer, which roughly corresponds with the proportion of students declaring transfer majors. As would be expected, the lowest proportion expressing plans to transfer were at Lowell and Palmerston, the two trade technical/institutions. The largest proportion (43 percent) who expressed plans to transfer were planning to do so after obtaining an Associate of Arts degree. Some students (8 percent) planned to transfer before two years, as shown in common item 18 for the total sample. Another 12 percent planned to transfer after two years without obtaining their A.A. degree--adding up to 20 percent that planned to transfer without their associate degree.

Sixteen percent of the students were seeking associate degrees only, the institutional range being approximately 7 percent to 38 percent: the highest percentage at Palmerston, the southern trade/technical institution, and lowest percentages at the large city institutions including dominant Caucasian middle-class institutions and those with large enrollments of minority students. Less than 6 percent of the respondents reported seeking vocational certificates only, ranging from 0.4 percent to nearly 14 percent, the lowest at Ward, the private institution, the highest at Palmerston.

Fourteen percent of the students reported taking credits for occupational preparation and 8 percent to improve their occupational skills. (The categories of choice on this variable were not exclusive of each other, as respondents were requested to check as many choices as applied). There was variation among institutions but not as much as might be expected considering the variation among institutions in respect to their emphasis on vocational and technical training.

Approximately 11 percent of the students reported taking courses for personal enjoyment, the institutional range being from less than 2 percent (Palmerston) to over 23 percent (Langston). A little over 2 percent of the students reported as an objective making up high school deficiencies. This small percentage is to be expected considering that most already had their diploma and considering the corresponding percentage of students who gave this response to the item noted above which asked about their main reasons for going to college. Six percent of the students reported having a variety of other educational objectives, but there were no statistically significant differences among institutions in respect to the proportions of students who stated additional objectives. In sum, then, a considerable

majority of the students reported as their immediate objective transferring to a four-year college, usually in conjunction with attainment of an A.A. degree. A much smaller percentage reported several vocational objectives, suggesting that the vocational preparation stressed by the students as their most important reason for attending college (Table 5-14) was viewed by them in conjunction with a baccalaureate degree. Again, experiencing college for its intrinsic enjoyment seems to be of little importance to most of the students, whatever their objectives.

Of those students who planned to transfer to a four-year college or university, over 66 percent expected to obtain a baccalaureate degree (Table 5-17). There was significant variation among institutions on this variable. The proportion of students wanting only a bachelor's degree ranged from 47 percent at Manning to 85 percent at Palmerston. The differentiating factor was not clear cut, inasmuch as the two institutions at extreme opposites on this variable both enroll large proportions of minority students. The institution with the highest proportion of students planning on attaining a doctorate or professional degree was Manning, an inner-city college with a nearly exclusive Black enrollment. The lowest proportion of students intending to attain a post-graduate degree were enrolled at Lowell and Palmerston, the two institutions most emphasizing trade/technical education, and Ward, the private institution.

Approximately half of the students planning to transfer expected to attend a university (48 percent) rather than a four-year college (37 percent) or public or private teachers college (4 percent). In total, only a little over 12 percent of the students planned to attend some type of private senior college--a fact that may not be regarded lightly by those financially hard pressed institutions, many of which are counting upon transfer students for their sustenance. There is noticeable variation among institutions; students who planned to attend public four-year colleges ranged institutionally from less than 19 percent to 65 percent. An even wider range existed among the proportions of students who planned to attend a public university. The lowest proportion of students who planned to attend a public university were enrolled at Ward, the private institution, followed by students enrolled at an inner-city low socioeconomic institution, Langston, and Carter and Quanto, suburban community colleges. Generally there was no discernible pattern of differences except for the

low socioeconomic institution whose students planned to attend four-year colleges rather than a university.

Certainty and Importance of Educational Plans

The research review contained in Volume I of The Study of Junior Colleges makes it clear that there is an exceptionally high attrition rate among junior college students, and that most of them neither transfer, attain an Associate of Arts degree, or complete a vocational program. Three substantial predictors of these criteria, however, are the certainty of students' plans, and the importance both they and their parents place on their achieving their educational objectives. Therefore, these variables were considered especially important to include in the present survey.

Fifty-five percent of the students expressed certainty of attaining their educational objectives. Another 40 percent thought they may make it, but that it would be hard; 6 percent were doubtful or considered it unlikely that they would meet their objectives. There was relatively little variation among institutions on this objective. The reservations expressed by so many students about the completion of their educational objectives may in part be compensated for by the importance they place on their education.

Fully 88 percent of the students reported that college was either "important" or "very important" to them; 57 percent of the students reported that completing college was "very important" to them. Of course it is not clear from the data whether completion of college means completing a terminal program or obtaining a baccalaureate degree. But, regardless, this appears to be a very high proportion of students asserting the importance of completing college in light of the considerable previous research indicating an exceptionally high attrition rate among junior college students whether they were in transfer or vocational programs and the uncertainty they expressed about their college chances. Under the circumstances, there may be a lack of realism on the part of many of these students. On the other hand there may also be indicated by these figures significant motivation that might be capitalized on by the colleges they are attending.

In general, statistically significant differences exist across institutions on this variable but the pattern of differences is difficult to ascertain. The highest proportion of students reporting completing college to be "very important" were found at Manning and Palmerston, the same two institutions in which the greatest proportion reported completing college was important to their parents. Both of these institutions are characterized by heavy enrollments of low socioeconomic and minority students.

Forty-one percent of the students reported that it was "very important" to their parents that they complete college. Another 35 percent reported that it was "important" to their parents that they complete college. The remaining approximately 25 percent reported their parents were indifferent to their children completing college or considered completion of college relatively unimportant.

Differences among institutions were highly significant statistically. The institutional range of proportions of students reporting that it was "very important" to their parents that they finish college varied from 28 percent to 60 percent. The lowest proportion of students reporting these parental values attended Ward, the private institution with predominately male, night-time enrollment. As noted above, the largest proportion of students reporting these parental values attended Manning, the inner-city Black college, followed closely by Palmerston, a southern institution consisting of a large proportion of Black and low socioeconomic students. This suggests a real concern on the part of minority parents that their children complete higher education. If true, this fact may be particularly important in light of previous research which indicates a very high correlation between importance to parents that their children complete college and their children's actual completion. Where parental encouragement does not exist, the colleges might be serving their students well by offering consistent encouragement in place of parents. But this function would depend on more interaction between students and faculty and counselors than is evident in the faculty and counselor survey data.

In the meantime, a considerable majority of the students surveyed reported plans to transfer and at least obtain a baccalaureate degree. Those who influenced them in their educational and vocational plans were

reportedly their parents, their friends being a far distant second source. Teachers and counselors were generally viewed as having little or no influence. The reasons the students gave for attending college generally most frequently had to do with their vocational training, with little stress on general liberal education or their own personal enjoyment or enrichment. They reportedly chose to enter the specific colleges they did because of their low cost, specific courses offered, and their proximity to the students' homes.

Factors that previous research suggests are negatively related to the students completing their objectives are the lateness with which they decided to go to college, their relative lack of peer reinforcement, their heavy stress on vocationalism, exclusive of general education, and their lack of certainty of their plans. Positive correlates are the interest and interaction they received from their parents, and the importance they placed on college. In balance, the promise of many students completing their objectives is questionable, particularly in certain institutions.

But lack of promise coexists with compensating potential. For example, it is apparent that the junior colleges' goal of vocational training is clearly congruent with the needs of the majority of their students in spite of their avowed intention to complete at least four years of college. Moreover, the finding that few students are interested in liberal education and community and world affairs may be of interest since previous research has found that the predominant proportion of students who persist in college for four years place **greater emphasis** than withdrawals on general education and appreciation of ideas and knowledge, apparently a value not shared by most of the students in the present sample whether or not they intend to transfer. Perhaps one way of helping junior college students select realistic goals for themselves would be to inform them of the characteristics of the majority of students who successfully complete a four year program. If it were pointed out to them, for instance, that their values significantly differ from those of the four-year and advanced degree students, they may wish to reconsider the probability of their success in comparison with students of different values or to reconsider their own. Although, according to the literature, our society confers greater prestige to the four-year college student, the benefits of selecting

well defined, realistic career goals could be emphasized sufficiently by counselors and instructors to stimulate some re-evaluation on the part of junior college students who may now see the four-year college diploma as more important than adequate job preparation, or who perhaps may emphasize vocational training in some cases to the exclusion of their real educational and personal development.

Educational Status

The students' educational status was generally compatible with their expectations as indicated by much of the data that pertain to the following topics: (1) previous post high school experiences, (2) current enrollment status, (3) current college majors, (4) experience with remedial courses, (5) academic achievement, and (6) study and extra-curricular activities in college.

Previous Post High School Experience

Sixty-nine percent of the students reported that their current college was the first they had attended. Those schools in which the students more frequently reported this as their first school had predominantly white student bodies (Quanto, Newson, Meade, and Carter), whereas those in which students most frequently reported that they had previously attended other schools were those in which a large proportion of the student body was Black (Manning, Lowell, and Appleton). Appleton was notable in this regard with 60 percent having previously attended another college. However, it is a new school, a factor which probably accounts for its large enrollment of transfer students.

Of the 307 students (over 30 percent of the responding sample) who had previously attended another college, 37 percent reported that it had been another junior college and 34 percent had gone to a public university or college. Fifteen percent had attended a private university or college, 11 percent a private trade or business college, and 4 percent an extension center. In respect to these data at least, there is a large contingency of students who transfer to junior colleges, the distinct majority of whom transfer from four-year colleges and universities.

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents reported that they had never withdrawn from the college they were currently attending while the remaining 21 percent replied in the affirmative. The proportions of students who reported that they had withdrawn from the current college varied by institution from 10 percent at Palmerston to 36 percent at Carter.

Of the students who had previously withdrawn from their present school, 25 percent cited illness or personal problems as the reason, ranging from a high of 57 percent at Quanto to a low of 9 percent at Sherwood. Nineteen percent of the responding students reported withdrawing for financial reasons; 43 percent of the respondents at Manning cited financial problems, and over 30 percent at Appleton, Newson, and Sherwood stated the same reason. Apparently, however, the financial problems at the latter three schools have been alleviated since considerably fewer than 30 percent of the students reported that these problems continue to obstruct their educational progress. At Manning, the difficulties apparently have not been resolved, as students there still represented the highest proportion of those at all 15 schools who reported financial hardships.

Seventeen percent of the withdrawals said that they had done so because they had lost interest in school, the highest proportion (43 percent) being at Palmerston, the technical institution located in a rural area. Although this school has a large Black enrollment, it is doubtful that a loss of interest is related to ethnicity, as there were no students at Manning, an almost exclusively Black school who reported this reason; and at Meade, a largely white school, almost as many students (40 percent) as at Palmerston reported loss of interest as their reason for withdrawal.

Other specified reasons for withdrawal were military service (7 percent), moving from the area (5 percent), and academic difficulties (3 percent). Twenty-one percent of the responding students filled in miscellaneous reasons for their withdrawing that were not specified in the survey questionnaire. Equally important would be to know what the relevant factors were in the withdrawals' return to school, but these data, unfortunately, are not available.

Sixty percent of the students who had previously withdrawn from their present college withdrew for only one semester or quarter.

(Appleton was notably high in this regard, with 100 percent of the withdrawing students returning after only one semester.) On the other hand, however, 13 percent of the students who withdrew from their present college had been out of school for three years or longer. Ward was notable in this regard, with 39 percent of its withdrawing students remaining out of school for over three years. This is the same school where 38 percent of the sample reported, in response to item 40 in Form A (Appendix C), that income from their own jobs was their major source of educational support. At the same time, however, only 16 percent of Ward's students sampled indicated that finances represented a difficult or serious problem in terms of their educational progress. Apparently, many junior college students perceive working their way through school as a matter of course, and they do not view this work, with its concomitant interruptions, as an obstacle to their educational advancement.

Twenty-three percent of the respondents who failed to finish their education at their previous school reported as reasons for this failure either military service, financial problems, or uncertainty as to what they really wanted to do. Twenty percent reported academic problems. Schools with the highest frequency of responses in this latter category were those with predominantly white student bodies (Meade, Newson, Ward, and Kinsey), whereas those with the lowest frequencies were schools with large proportions of Black students (Appleton, Lowell, and Langston). Seventeen percent of the respondents who had previously attended another college said that they had not graduated because of changes in residence, another 17 percent because of a loss of interest in school, and 13 percent because of personal problems. In general, the schools with the highest frequency of responses in the personal problems category were those with predominately Caucasian student bodies (Meade, Walden, Carter, and Kinsey). Eleven percent said that they had not graduated because the school did not offer the courses they wanted and 8 percent reported "not knowing what it was all about." Other reasons not specified were reported by 20 percent of the respondents who had not completed their previous schools' programs.

In descending order of frequency, then, the students' reasons given for their failure to graduate from previously attended colleges were as follows: financial, being unclear about what they wanted to do academic

problems, other, loss of interest in school, changes in residence, military service, personal problems, courses unavailable, and their not knowing what it was all about.

Twenty percent of those students who had previously withdrawn from another college reported that they had been out of school for only one semester or quarter. Newson was notable in this regard with 50 percent returning after only one semester or quarter out of school. Thirty-eight percent of students who had previously withdrawn from another college had been out of school for one year or less. Again, Newson was notable in this regard, with 88 percent returning within one year. On the other hand, 26 percent of the students who had withdrawn from another school reported that they had stayed out of school for more than five years. The distribution frequency ranged from a high of 46 percent at Meade to a low of zero at Newson.

Twenty percent of the students sampled had already earned a post-high school degree or certificate prior to the time of the survey, including 2 percent who had earned a bachelor's degree and 1 percent who had earned a graduate degree and 12 percent who had earned a certificate. The lowest proportions of students reporting having certificates or degrees were at schools with high proportions of Caucasian students (Newson, Kinsey, and Ward). The highest frequencies were found among students at schools with large proportions of Black students and with vocational emphases (Lowell and Palmerston). An Associate of Arts degree was already earned by 5 percent of the students reporting with a high of 17 percent at Lowell.

One school, Lowell, (a large, racially diverse inner-city school with a strong emphasis on vocational technical courses) showed a disproportionately high number of respondents (52 percent compared to approximately 20 percent across schools) who had earned degrees or certificates. This school awards several types of vocational certificates, and 45 percent of its respondents reported having achieved such a certificate or an Associate of Arts degree. This school was also among the six institutions with relatively high proportions (6 to 7 percent) of students who had at least a baccalaureate degree: Appleton, Langston, Palmerston, and Sherwood, all with large minority enrollments and strong vocational programs, and Ward, the private institution with its large

male, adult enrollment. According to some administrators interviewed in this study, four-year college graduates, unable to find jobs, are enrolling in community colleges to develop saleable vocational skills. These data may reflect this occurrence.

Current Enrollment Status

The students' responses to the question regarding the number of semester or quarter units they had completed indicated that most of them were on a semester system, and also that the pattern of responses between those who reported semester units and those who reported quarter units were comparable. Consequently, for simplicity of discussion, only semester units are considered in the following discussion.

As shown in Table 5-18, 57 percent of the students were freshmen (as determined by having completed 30 semester units or less) and a little over 25 percent had reached at least a high sophomore standing (46 or more units). There was considerable variation on this variable with the largest proportion of high sophomore students (approximately 43 percent) at Sherwood, the southern metropolitan college where the students also reported the highest grade averages, closely followed by Ward, the private institution. The highest proportions of beginning freshman enrollments were at Kinsey, Manning, Palmerston, and Quanto, each with over 40 percent of first-term students.

The subsample of students queried about the number of terms they had attended their present college reported a wide range of exposure. The average distribution of students by number of terms which they have attended at their current college is as follows: one, 36 percent; two, 16 percent; three or four, 28 percent; five or six, 14 percent; seven, 2 percent; and more than seven, 5 percent. (The total exceeds 100 percent due to rounding off of decimals.) Newson, a rural mid-west college, and Manning, a Black inner-city school, had a disproportionately high number of respondents who were first-term students (54 and 51 percent respectively), whereas Ward and Lowell had a large proportion who had attended seven or more terms.

Nearly 66 percent of the students reported being full time, but the institutional range was large, from 12 percent at Ward to over 95 percent at Quanto and Newson. At Carter, Langston, and Lowell, approximately half of the students were part time, and at Manning and Newson, a

disproportionately high percentage were full-time (66 and 90 percent respectively). Although a clear majority of the responding students were attending these junior colleges full-time, a large proportion were attending part-time.*

Most students (over 90 percent) were enrolled in regular credit classes. Although there were significant differences among institutions on this variable, only two schools obviously departed from this pattern. These were Langston and Lowell--both inner-city institutions which emphasize trade/technical curricula--where approximately 75 percent of the students were taking regular credit courses.

Less than 6 percent of the students were enrolled in adult education classes. Among the individual institutions the percentages ranged from 0 to approximately 21 percent, with the highest proportion at Lowell. The low enrollment figures in adult education indicated by the data do not necessarily reflect on the colleges' efforts to stimulate community involvement. One administrator at Lowell, the school with the highest enrollment in this type of program, discussed his efforts and those of his staff to interest segments of the community in the college's adult curricula. It is an outreach effort, sometimes hindered by the college's budgetary considerations, and sometimes limited by community apathy. It seems more probable that colleges would cooperate with communities intent on expanding their opportunities for adult education than would communities respond with sufficient interest in such programs.

Less than 3 percent of the students enrolled in non-credit courses with no significant differences among institutions on this variable. The majority of students (approximately 70 percent) were enrolled in day classes only (55 percent), or day and night classes (15 percent). Thirty percent were enrolled in night classes only with considerable variation on this variable ranging from less than 1 percent at Newson and Palmerston, the two rural institutions, and Quanto, the large east coast city college, to the two high representations of 59 percent at Lowell, a large city

*Full-time students may have been overrepresented in the sample in as much as 8 of the participating institutions reported that at least 50 percent of their students were part-time as indicated in the Institutional Profiles (see Chapter 3 and Appendix A).

trade/technical institution, and 96 percent at Ward, the private institution with a heavy adult male enrollment.

Current Majors

Although previous research would suggest that community college students are frequently undecided about their major, a considerable proportion (81 percent) did declare a major (Table 5-20). A clear majority of the responding students declared transfer majors, but also a large proportion (40 percent) declared terminal majors, a larger proportion than the 37 percent of the sample that reported not intending to transfer. The students distributed themselves rather evenly across academic majors with the largest proportion of students (32 percent) declaring majors in the pre-professions taken as a whole (medical, agricultural, educational, and other professional). Next to the pre-professional transfer majors, generally, the most popular were the liberal arts (9 percent) and social sciences (9 percent), followed by science and mathematics (3 percent), fine arts (3 percent), and the humanities (2 percent). Very few students had a major in agriculture, whether transfer (1.3 percent) or terminal (0.5 percent). Next to agriculture, the smallest proportion of students were majoring in applied arts (1.6 percent). The terminal majors with the largest proportion of the total students sampled were business (16 percent), technical (12 percent), and health services (8 percent).

Obviously, the institutions with emphasis on technical, terminal students had the heaviest enrollment of students in these areas. The academic major which appeared to vary the most by institution was Liberal Arts, ranging from 0 percent at Lowell and Palmerston, the two trade technical institutions (without Liberal Arts majors) to over 23 percent at Quanto, the large east coast college. There were institutional differences among all majors, but with no clear patterns other than those mentioned.

Remedial Courses

Seventeen percent of the students reportedly were enrolled in remedial classes, the institutional range being 8 percent to 29 percent.

Although the highest percentage of students taking remedial classes were enrolled in low socioeconomic status institutions, a number of predominately middle-class institutions also had relatively large proportions of students in remedial classes. The overall figure of 17 percent corresponds to the figures discussed in the literature pertaining to remedial students, and is considered grossly inadequate compared to the large numbers in need of remedial basic skills courses. Although, in the literature reviewed in Volume I of the project, California was purported to have high proportions of students in remedial programs, the data in the present study do not support this claim.

Most remedial courses reported were in English and mathematics. Sixty-four percent of those enrolled in remedial courses were taking remedial English, 50 percent mathematics and 19 percent other remedial courses. The largest proportions of students reported taking remedial English courses were enrolled at Palmerston and Langston, institutions with large representation of Black students. This was not consistently true, however, for students enrolled in remedial mathematics courses.

Few students reported a grade less than a "C" in the remedial courses regardless of institution. Almost 100 percent of those remedial course students enrolled in two colleges, Foster and Manning--large inner-city schools with large minority enrollments--received grades over "C."

Academic Achievement

The students' reports of their cumulative grade averages in college were skewed in a positive direction, and higher than their reported high school averages (Table 5-21). Over 50 percent of the students were making a "B" average or better, with nearly 81 percent of the students at one institution near a university, Sherwood, reporting making at least a "B" average. Approximately 10 percent of the students at Walden, Newson, Palmerston, and Shaw reported a "C-" or less grade average compared to 6 percent of the aggregate sample. The greatest institutional differences apparently occurred among the proportions of students reporting an "A" average, ranging from approximately 5 percent at Newson to over 30 percent at Sherwood. No clear relationship existed between institutional characteristics and student achievement, however.

Study and Extra-Curricular Activities

Eighteen percent of the students reported spending three or less hours per week in class; a total of 36 percent reported spending six or less hours per week in class; ranging from a high of 58 percent at Ward to a low of 13 percent at Quanto. On the other hand, 43 percent of the students reported that they spent 13 or more hours per week in class. These response frequencies varied from a high of 75 percent at Newson to a low response rate of 3 percent at Ward, where many students were part-time and reported that the main reasons for their choosing their college were that it was close to home and that it offered the particular courses that they wanted.

Twenty-four percent of the students reported that they spent 3 hours or less per week studying. A total of 52 percent of the students said they studied 6 hours or less; with the highest frequency in this category reported at Ward, Appleton, and Langston (between 67 and 72 percent), and the lowest at Newson, Kinsey, Quanto, and Shaw (between 36 and 43 percent). On the other hand, 17 percent of the students reportedly spent 13 or more hours per week studying. The exceptionally low response rate in this category was reported at Ward, where only 9 percent of the students indicated that they studied this intensively, but where a large proportion of respondents were part time students and adult males with families to support, factors which likely account for their limited study time.

A majority of responding students (58 percent) reported spending only 3 hours or less a week in extra-curricular activities; approximately 72 percent reported spending six hours or less each week in these activities. An unusually high rate of 29 percent of the students did not respond to this item, suggesting they were not involved in extra-curricular activities, which would greatly inflate the first figure of 58 percent. At the other extreme, 12 percent of the responding students reported spending more than 15 hours per week in such activities. Although there was no appreciable pattern in the distribution of responses among schools, at Manning and Ward students apparently spent considerably less time in extra-curricular activities; and at Appleton, considerably more. The

former schools were also markedly different from Appleton in that their students came from less advantaged backgrounds in terms of their parents' occupations, education, and family income.

There were marked differences in the amount the students reported participation in high school versus college extra-curricular activities (item 48, Form B, Appendix C). The range of "very much" participation in nine specified activities in high school varied from 3 to 27 percent; in only one case (music, art and drama) did as many as six percent of the students report this much involvement in college. Conversely, between 81 and 93 percent of the students reported "little or no" participation in all of the specified activities in college, whereas in only one case (political groups) did such a high proportion of students report such little involvement in high school. The greatest discrepancies in at least "some" participation between high school and college occurred in sports (63 versus 17 percent); music, art, and drama (53 versus 20 percent); miscellaneous academic groups related to school work (47 versus 19 percent); and student government (33 versus 10 percent).

Both in high school and in college, students at Manning consistently represented the highest proportions of those involved in extracurricular activities, and those at Ward, the lowest. Overall, there appeared to be a marked tendency for students at schools with vocational emphases and with relatively large proportions of Black students to participate in most high school and college activities in greater proportions than students at schools with strong transfer programs and with relatively small proportions of Black students.

The educational status as revealed by the students surveyed invites further investigation on a broader base. For example, the respectable achievement levels reported by the students might well be examined in light of the high attrition rate common for junior college students. The majority of students were full time, but many were part time; the majority were taking transfer majors, but many were not; the majority had no certificate or degree, but many did; few students were taking adult or non-credit courses, and few were involved in extra-curricular activities. The diversity and, in some respects, circumscribed educational status, exemplified here bring into still sharper focus the difficulties of complex curricula planning. Some junior college administrators, in

discussing the problems during the course of this study, recommended the division of programs among community colleges within a given area as a means of enabling each school to concentrate on the best possible, albeit limited, curriculum (and, we would hope, co-curriculum) offerings. They argued that the inconvenience to students having to commute longer distances for particular programs would be outweighed by the advantage of improved facilities and equipment and highly specialized teachers at individual schools. The current overlap of programs in colleges within a single area, they felt, results in a "watering down" of educational quality.

Generally, the small proportions of students who participated in extra-curricular college activities projects an image of the junior college student as one more laden with responsibilities of daily living than is the student at a four-year institution. If this image is accurate, it would seem that students at two-year institutions should receive more attention in terms of financial aids, scholarships, living arrangements, and other efforts which might encourage the completion of their educational goals, and incidentally, alleviate the problem of high attrition at these schools. Of course, the students may not want to get fully involved with their colleges, regardless of financial circumstances. If so, perhaps ways ought to be sought to encourage them to do so, since thereby they stand to benefit much more fully from their college experiences.

Financial and Occupational Status

The continuing and future educational status of students depends heavily upon their financial resources. Their educational progress and financial status combined will also greatly affect the careers of many students. Consequently, the students sampled were asked a series of questions about their financial support, current occupational status, and career expectations.

Sources of Support

The proportions of students who reported various sources contributing over 50 percent of the financial support for their education are

shown in composite Table 5-22. The complete range of the amount of contribution is shown proportionately for each source in Table 5-23. An unusually high proportion of the students sampled failed to respond to item 40, Form A, from which the critical financial data contained in Tables 5-22 and 5-23 were derived. Possibly many students considered this information privileged and others may have been unable to estimate the relative contribution of the various sources of their support. In any event, the following data must be reviewed with the missing responses in mind.

Since a high percentage of students attending community colleges came from low income families, it was not surprising to find that few of the responding students received, or at least perceived that they received, a large amount of support from their families. Although almost half (47 percent) of the respondents indicated that they were living with their parents, less than 8 percent indicated that room and board provided by their parents contributed at least half of their support; less than 6 percent said that family support other than room and board constituted over half of their financial support. Apparently, many students took for granted the fact that their financial burden was eased by living at home and did not consider this arrangement as contributing to their financial resources.

Nearly 25 percent of the respondents indicated that their own income supplied over half of their support, including over 9 percent of the students who specified their own savings as a major source of their educational support. Sources other than their own and their families' support accounted for relatively little of the respondents' educational support, as indicated by the following synthesis of proportions of students reporting the other specified or miscellaneous sources as contributing over 50 percent or anything at all to their support:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Over 50 Percent</u>	<u>Anything</u>
Spouse	5	9
Scholarship	1	4
Loan	2	5
G.I. Bill	11	20
Other Gov't. Benefits	3	5
Other	5	8

Next to the G.I. Bill, spouses and miscellaneous sources filled in by the students reportedly provided the next greatest financial contribution to the respondents' education. Scholarships and loans apparently made a negligible contribution to their education. The G.I. Bill and other government benefits contributed relatively little to the students considering their financial backgrounds. In fact, no more than 25 percent of the students reported receiving any support from these sources.

Many of these junior college students are known to come from low-income families as demonstrated in the above section on their background characteristics. Under the circumstances the governmental, loan, and scholarship aid reportedly provided them appears severely limited. Indeed, it is difficult to see how college doors can remain open to them. And yet, as can be seen in Table 5-24 below and in Table 5-27 included in the following discussion on occupational status, few of the students felt that financial problems or work would prevent them from completing their education. Of course, this remains to be seen.

There were some differences among institutions in response to the question about source of financial support. For example, over 43 percent of the respondents at Lowell and Langston, both highly integrated city schools with an emphasis on vocational/technical programs, reported that at least 76 percent of their support was provided by their own incomes, exclusive of their savings, compared to approximately 26 percent of the aggregate. At Newson, located in a rural area, only 6 percent reported that they support themselves mainly by their own incomes; at Quanto, Appleton, and Manning, students reported more support from their families than at other schools; and at Ward, 23 percent were largely dependent upon the G.I. Bill for their education.

Although 5 percent of the respondents indicated that "other" financial sources contributed over 50 percent of their support, again at Ward, the small private college, 38 percent cited this category as providing a major source of income--specifying that their employers reimbursed them for tuition--whereas at Meade and Quanto, the two other institutions classified as high socioeconomic level colleges, few students (less than 6 percent and 0 percent, respectively) indicated that other sources contributed over half of their support.

In general, despite the low proportions of students who received any type of financial assistance, approximately 73 percent of all respondents indicated that finances posed no problem or only a minor one to their educational progress, while approximately 28 percent felt that finances constituted a difficult or serious problem (Table 5-24). The three schools where between 34 percent and 45 percent of the respondents indicated that finances posed a difficult or serious problem were colleges where nearly half or more of the students were Black (Langston, Manning, and Foster).

The fact that nearly 28 percent of the respondents did indicate that finances represented a difficult or serious problem for their educational program should render it reasonable that these students would have attempted to alleviate this problem by applying for scholarships or loans while in school. According to the data, however, only a small proportion of junior college students had any sort of financial aid. In fact, as above, 96 percent received no support from this source, leaving only 2 percent who obtained over half of their support from scholarships. Moreover, only 16 percent of the respondents had actually tried to obtain a scholarship or loan while in school, and only 7 percent received either a loan or a scholarship, less than half who sought such aid.

Compounding the apparent lack of financial assistance is the fact that a large proportion of students were really not aware of what assistance might have been available (Table 5-25). Fifty-eight percent of the students indicated that they were not aware of federal aid programs, and of those who responded to the item asking if students were aware of financial aid at their schools, 66 percent answered "yes" 31 percent answered "I think so" and 4 percent answered in the negative. However, 39 percent of the students did not respond to this item. Considering the large proportion of students who did not respond at all and the many who replied "I think so", it appears that a great number of students were at least unsure of the availability of financial aid of any kind.

Although differences among schools were significant, no clear pattern of institutional differences was apparent. One qualification may be noted, however: at Foster and Langston where about 40 percent of the students reported financial difficulties, about 80 percent had not tried

to obtain financial assistance with their education, and about 58 percent had never heard of such assistance. Apparently, particularly at these and similar schools, college personnel should make greater efforts to inform students of the existence of local, federal, and other types of financial aids.

Employment Status

Since a large proportion of students indicated that their own income constituted their major source of support, it was almost inevitable that over 66 percent of the students were employed and that less than 5 percent expected not to be working at all during their college years (Table 5-26). The highest employment rate (90 percent) was at Ward, the private institution (where the highest percentage of students attended classes at night). The lowest percentage was found at the two colleges consisting of the highest Black enrollment, Palmerston and Manning, which may be a reflection of Blacks' difficulties in getting employment or the fact that both colleges had relatively high percentages of students receiving financial aid. Less than 3 percent of the students at Manning, however, and less than 6 percent at Palmerston reported that they had no plans to work as yet.

Nearly 50 percent of the students reported working 40 hours per week or more. Over 75 percent worked at least half time; less than 4 percent reported working 10 hours or less. The highest rates of full-time employment were 85 percent at Ward and 70 percent at the two trade-technical schools. Only two institutions, Newson and Quanto, departed from the trend of full-time employment. Only 6 percent of the responding students at these schools reported working full time. Nevertheless, despite the fact that, compared to students attending the other community colleges, fewer students attending Newson and Quanto worked full time, 80 percent of the students did report working between 10 and 30 hours per week.

The three most important reasons for working cited by students were to support themselves and/or their families, to pay for their education, and for extra money for such expenses as entertainment, clothes, and cars. Since approximately 33 percent of the students were married with families to support and since so many were from low socioeconomic backgrounds,

it does not seem surprising to find that over 53 percent of the students worked to support themselves and their families.

Eighteen percent of the students indicated that they worked in order to pay for their education exclusively, although the majority of respondents who reported working to support themselves must also have been including their educational expenses. Another 18 percent of the students reported working for spending money. Six percent of the students reported working because they liked their job; none of the students reported working to help support their parents. Paramount in these findings is the large proportion of responding students who were working to support themselves or their families. Perplexing is the large proportion of students (44 percent) who did not give their reasons for working, exceeding the 23 percent of the students who were not currently working.

The reasons for working varied among institutions. In four schools, Langston, Lowell, Manning, and Ward, over 80 percent of the students reported that they were working to support themselves and/or their education, whereas at Quanto and Appleton, less than 50 percent worked to support themselves or their education. Quanto and Appleton are high and middle socioeconomic status institutions, respectively, located in suburban-urban areas, which presumably enroll fewer lower socioeconomic status students than is the case at Lowell and Manning, which, therefore likely have more students who may have to work. As pointed out previously, Ward's students were predominately married men attending college part time, most of whom were working full time.

It seems reasonable to expect that students would experience some difficulties in trying to support themselves and their families at the same time they were trying to complete an education. However, according to their responses, this was not the case with the majority of students (Table 5-27). Of the approximately 70 percent who did work (i.e., 699 of the 1026 respondents to item 47 of Form A), 48 percent indicated that having less time for studying was any sort of a problem. Taking longer to finish school and having to carry fewer courses were each cited by 26 percent of the students as effects of their working.

Few of these students perceived working as directly affecting achievement; only 11 percent felt that they had earned a lower grade in a class

due to working, and only 3 percent blamed their employment for a failing course grade. Nineteen percent, on the other hand, indicated that working had no effect whatsoever on their educational progress. Furthermore, only a small percentage indicated that the effects of working were so drastic as to possibly require them to leave school temporarily (5 percent) or to possibly stand in the way of their finishing at all (3 percent). As a matter of fact, of the students who reported having withdrawn either from another community college or from the community college they were now attending, only 19 percent cited financial problems as the reason for their withdrawal. There were institutional variations, however, with 43 percent of the student withdrawals citing financial reasons at Manning, and over 30 percent at Appleton, Newson, and Sherwood.

One explanation for the small percentages of students who felt that work would have a drastic effect on their educational progress might be found in the fact that a majority of responding students who worked (56 percent) had jobs which were directly or indirectly related to the courses they were studying in college. At Ward, where many of the students reported that their education was financially subsidized by their employer or by the company for which they worked, 84 percent reported that their work was related to their course of study. In fact, nearly 64 percent were planning to remain in their present occupational field (Table 5-28). Apparently, many of the Ward men had regular jobs and were upgrading their knowledge or skills specifically for the benefit of their employment. The largest proportions of students (62 percent) indicating that their work was not related to their studies were at Walden and Kinsey, both largely Caucasian schools with an enrollment from the middle socioeconomic strata, and an emphasis on transfer courses.

In comparing institutions, the reported effect on students of working varied widely. Statistical differences were highly significant although no institutional patterns were apparent. For example, while only 4 percent or less of the respondents at Newson, Palmerston, and Quanto believed that working would lengthen the time that it would take them to complete their education, as many as 59 percent of the students at Ward believed this would be the case. Whereas no one at Quanto or Palmerston felt it would be necessary to leave school even temporarily, 16 percent

at Langston felt that this was a possibility. While no one at Newson, Meade, or Appleton feared failing classes as a result of employment, 10 percent of the working respondents at Shaw felt this could happen, and although no one at Palmerston believed that his grade point average would lower, over 21 percent at Foster were reportedly concerned about this.

In general, then, although the students did not perceive working to be a major detriment to their educational progress, it should be remembered that these responses are self-perceived effects, and therefore there is a need to evaluate the effects of students' working in terms of more objective criteria such as grade point averages, length of time to complete school, and attrition rates.

Occupational Expectations

Even though, as indicated above, 56 percent of the responding students considered their jobs at least indirectly related to their course work, less than half (41 percent) of the respondents planned to make a career of their current jobs (Table 5-28). There appeared to be little relation between attendance at a vocational school and plans to make a career out of current jobs, although at both Lowell and Langston, two vocationally-oriented schools, the proportions of students planning such careers were 26 and 48 percent, respectively.

When asked about their specific occupational plans, approximately 42 percent indicated that they aspired to the two top occupational categories, Professional I and II (Table 5-29). The largest percentage (33 percent) aspired to Professional I, a category including such occupations as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, school teacher, engineer, and certified public accountant. Ten percent of the students indicated that they were interested in skilled clerical or sales positions. At the other extreme, over 10 percent of the students expected to enter "semi-skilled or unskilled work" including nearly 5 percent who expected to enter the lowest category of occupations, "general worker." The occupation selected by the least number of respondents (0.8 percent) was "farm owner or manager."

Questions arise as to why students taking post-high school training would expect to assume unskilled or even semi-skilled occupations or why less than 6 percent of the students expected to work at skilled crafts in

spite of the many trade-technical programs in their colleges. Questions also arise about how realistic some of the students were about their professional expectations when research consistently indicates that generally only about a third of entering junior college students actually transfer to a senior college, with proportionately fewer obtaining a baccalaureate degree, and particularly a professional degree. But their expectations might also be viewed disproportionately low in light of the clear majority of students who reported plans to transfer and obtain at least a bachelor's degree.

Institutional variation existed on this variable, especially with regard to three categories: skilled craftsman (approximately 2 percent at Meade to approximately 21 percent at Lowell); lower level managerial and professional (approximately 16 percent at Palmerston to 45 percent at Ward); and higher level professional (approximately 2 percent at Palmerston to over 18 percent at Manning). Over 53 percent of the Manning students expected to enter either Professional I or II occupations, which is consistent with the positive view they exhibited toward themselves throughout much of the data in the survey.. The consistency of the Manning students' positive responses may reflect strong motivation and self-esteem on their part which may be a good predictor (and source) of the attainment of their goals.

The students were also asked to indicate which of 19 specified traits or skills that they felt would be of first, second, and third most needed in their future vocations (item 47, Form C). The students covered the gamut of the traits with the exception of physical attractiveness which none of the students saw as either first most important or second most important to their future vocations. Three traits, however, stood out above the others as being perceived as most important to the students' future vocations. These were, in order; the students' ability to deal with people, their drive to succeed, and understanding of others. Two additional variables stood out more than the others when second and third most important skills or traits were examined. These were social self-confidence and communication skills. Whether speaking of the first, second, or third most important skill or trait needed for future vocations, no more than 23 percent of the students indicated any one item. Statistically significant differences among institutions existed for the

first and second most important traits but not the third. However, with rare exception was there more than a 10 percent difference among the institutions and seldom that large.

Regardless of institution, students did not seem to consider mechanical, clerical, academic leadership, mathematical, or even communication ability so important as skills in interpersonal relations and personal drive as prerequisites to success in their future vocations.

Certainly the drive to succeed and the ability to deal with people are essential variables contributing to occupational success. However, it is not clear whether students interpreted the ability to deal with people as a phenomenon of positive interpersonal and communication skills or as a concept of manipulation and the right connections. The fact that so many students apparently viewed the occupational world as the key to social mobility and aspired in great proportions to high status positions, at the same time underplaying the value of academic ability and leadership, seems to support the assumption that many of these students felt that occupational success is a matter of knowing and getting along with the "right people." Few people today will dispute the fact that college has become the gateway to much of the occupational world, particularly to professional and higher managerial status. The hope expressed here, however, is that college will also serve as a gateway to a fuller life, intellectual and cultural as well as social and vocational.

But what about that gateway? Most of the students sampled reportedly supported themselves and their education with very little assistance otherwise, particularly from scholarships, loans, or government aid. A great many were not aware of what little assistance might exist. Most of the students worked, nearly half full time. And yet they were sanguine; they did not feel that their financial situation or working would keep them from completing their education. They also had high career expectations along with notions about needed career skills that may be too circumscribed.

The record to date, however, would predict that the majority of these students will not realize their educational or career goals. Yet, the record might change with more attention and support given the means and quantity of financial assistance, together with increased assistance

to students in exploring educational and occupational alternatives most suiting their interests and potentials.

Students' Evaluation of Themselves and Their Colleges

Effort was made to learn the students' assessment of their collegiate "gateway" and their own and their fellow students' situation in that "gateway." Thus a random subsample of the students were quizzed extensively about the following topics: (1) problems affecting their academic progress; (2) their personal traits and skills; (3) their evaluation of their instruction; (4) their evaluation of their colleges' student personnel services, including the nature of what counseling they had experiences; and (5) the types of college they preferred.

Problems Affecting Academic Progress

Generally the students as a whole rejected the notion that they had problems that might hinder their academic progress (item 42, Form C). Out of the 32 problems enumerated, only 5 were seen by as many as approximately 50 percent of the students as any kind of problem at all. These were "being so busy that they were tired all the time," "not knowing how to study," "not liking to study," and "finding some of their courses too hard." Generally less than 10 percent of the students saw any of the problems as being serious enough to cause them to earn lower grades or to cause them to fail to complete their education. Only in one instance did as much as 19 percent see a problem severe enough to lower their grades or cause them to leave college, that being "short of money."

Looking at the matter in another way, where students felt they had a problem at all, the considerable majority felt that it was one they could deal with. These data represent another example of the possibility of a lack of realism, awareness, or of openness about their problems on the part of the students, given what is known about the extremely high attrition rate of junior college students and their learning problems. Yet, most of them did report grade averages sufficient enough, perhaps, to prevent them from having to worry a great deal about their

academic progress.

Fifteen of the 32 variables failed to distinguish among the institutions with any statistical significance and another 8 of the variables distinguished among the institutions with statistical significance too low to consider seriously, given the large size of the sample. This left only 9 variables in this context which distinguished among institutions with a high level of statistical significance, namely:

1. Students disappointed that the college was not as exciting as they would have liked it to be
2. Students' perception that they were wasting time in school
3. Students' concern that they didn't know how to study
4. Students' fighting with their parents a lot
5. Finding classes dull and boring
6. Being short of money
7. Not knowing what to do in life
8. Not really liking school
9. Being too depressed or anxious to study

Patterns of institutional differences were not readily discernible.

Personal Traits and Skills

The students were asked to compare themselves to college students in general on 19 skills and traits as indicated in item 47 of Form C. On the whole, the students manifested a fairly high positive self-concept. On only one trait, artistic ability, did any large proportion of students perceive themselves as poor or below average--in this case, 44 percent. Thirty-three percent of the students perceived themselves as below average in mathematic skills. Approximately 27 percent of the students considered themselves below average in athletic and mechanical abilities. Otherwise, no more than 24 percent of the students saw themselves below average, and rarely did the proportion of students rating themselves poor or below average reach that dimension.

Considerably more of the students saw themselves above average than below average on the 19 traits. In at least 4 of the traits, 50 percent or more of the students rated themselves above average; these were ability to deal with people (59 percent), understanding of others (58 percent),

ability to care for small children (53 percent); and drive to succeed (49 percent). In essence, a large majority of the students saw themselves as at least average and frequently above average on all 19 traits. For the most part, this tendency existed regardless of the institution the students attended. Only 4 items distinguished among institutions statistically--mechanical ability, academic ability, self-confidence, and physical attractiveness.

Ward College was singular in its disproportionately large group of students who perceived themselves as above average in mechanical ability. Carter was unique in its disproportionately large group of students who perceived themselves above average in academic ability. In contrast, Lowell, the large city trade/technical college, was singular with its small proportions of students (7 percent) who considered themselves above average in academic ability. As might be expected, institutions with disproportionately large numbers of low socioeconomic status and minority students tended to have students who considered themselves above average in academic ability.

Three institutions, Langston, Manning, and Foster, were outstanding in the disproportionately large group of students who considered themselves above average in social self-confidence. Each of these institutions had disproportionately high enrollment of students of low socioeconomic status and minority backgrounds. Lowell was singular in the low proportion of its students that considered themselves above average in social self-confidence.

No clear pattern is apparent in institutional differences in proportions of students who consider themselves above average in physical attractiveness. Only Langston was singular in its disproportionately large group of students who considered themselves above average or outstanding on this trait. This school is a large inner-city community college with a large enrollment of low socioeconomic status and minority students.

The students appeared fairly homogenous, then, in their self-ratings in that this homogeneity appears to cut across institutions. This situation seems to warrant much further investigation in as much as previous research has shown these variables to be highly related to academic progress at both the pre-college and college levels.

The students were asked in addition to indicate which of the 19 traits they considered the 3 most important that they would need in their future vocations. The students covered the gamut of which traits they thought to be most important. However, as indicated in the above discussion on the students' occupational expectations, 3 stood out in the range of proportions of the most important traits. These were ability to deal with people (21 percent), drive to succeed (15 percent), and understanding of others (10 percent). Two additional traits turned out to be relatively important in the students' minds when the second and third most important traits were considered as well; these were social self-confidence and communication skills.

When asked to compare their fellow students at their own college with college students generally on the same 19 traits and skills, a definite majority of the students (in most cases between 65 and 75 percent) saw their fellow students as average compared with college students generally on all of the traits and skills. Only in one case--study skills--did as large a proportion as 18 percent rate their fellow students below average compared to other college students. No less a proportion than 13 percent of the students rated their fellow students as above average, and approximately 25 percent or more of the students rated their fellow students above average on one-half of the items.

Eight out of the 19 items distinguished significantly among the 15 institutions. These were drive to succeed, homemaking skills, artistic ability, athletic ability, leadership ability, ability to care for small children, creativity, and physical attractiveness. Patterns of differences among institutions are difficult to discern with two notable exceptions. Two inner-city schools with heavy minority enrollments more than all others rated their fellow students above average. This was particularly the case at Manning whose students, far and above all other institutions, rated their fellow students above average, especially in reference to leadership ability, ability to care for small children, creativity, and physical attractiveness. Two institutions stood out more than the others as rating their fellow students below average. These were students at Walden--the same college whose students disproportionately rated their instructors and counselors negatively--and particularly Ward.

One interpretation of these findings is that low socioeconomic status and particularly minority students have a much more positive self-concept than has been indicated in past research. Another interpretation is that the students sampled saw themselves very much like all other students, generally average and, to some degree, above average in the specified skills and traits. Moreover, on the basis of items previously discussed, they pretty much viewed themselves without problems that would handicap their completing college. A final interpretation, therefore, is that these students were very positive thinking, many of whom may not have been all that aware of their capacities and their potentials.

Evaluation of Instructors

Thirteen positive statements were submitted to the students having to do with various features of teaching effectiveness (item 46, Form C). The students were asked to indicate to what extent they felt that the statements described their instructors at their college by indicating whether they "strongly agreed," "agreed," "neither disagreed nor agreed," "disagreed," or "strongly disagreed" with each statement (Table 5-30). Strong agreement or agreement, of course, indicated the students' positive evaluation of their instructors.

The vast majority of all students either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with each of the 13 statements submitted to them. Strong agreement was indicated by 23 to 41 percent of the students across the 13 items, with the strongest endorsement given instructors for their apparent interest in teaching and knowing their subject well. Disagreement of any kind for any statement was expressed by no more than 12 percent of the students. What disagreement occurred at all pertained primarily to three items: the instructors' holding their students' attention; their organizing their courses well; and their stimulating their students intellectually (that is, causing them to think).

Only five of the items discriminated among the institutions with any statistical significance. These were instructors' interest in their students, instructors' ability to hold their students' attention, instructors' grading fairly, instructors' encouraging their students to

express their opinions; and instructors' stimulating their students intellectually. The proportions of students strongly agreeing to these statements varied across institutions from approximately 15 percent to 55 percent. The one exception was the matter of the instructors' ability to hold their students' attention. The largest proportion of students by institution strongly agreeing with this statement was 45 percent and few institutions had more than 25 percent of their students' strongly endorsing this statement.

The students at four of the institutions and primarily two of these institutions consistently rated their instructors highest compared to students at all of the other institutions. The two institutions that were most singular for their students strongly agreeing with the positive statements about their instructors' teaching effectiveness were Lowell, a large west coast inner-city college with a heavy Black enrollment and Manning. The two other institutions with high faculty ratings were Palmerston and Sherwood.

Six, particularly two, of the institutions had students who consistently gave their instructors the lowest ratings. The schools with students giving their instructors the lowest ratings included Walden, Ward, Meade, Newson, Carter, and Shaw. Newson and Walden were singular for the proportion of their students that rated their instructors comparatively low on the discriminating items. In fact, Walden's students rated their instructors lowest of all other groups of students on all items. Again, this is the same institution whose students rated their counselors lowest compared to the students at the other institutions, as will be noted in discussion to follow. In essence then, although not all items discriminated among institutions, five of them did, and differences were systematic, suggesting that it is something about the nature of the instructors' instruction at the institutions that is accounting for variability along these dimensions and not simply individual differences among students.

Student-faculty interaction outside of class appeared surprisingly nominal. This is true especially considering the high evaluation the students gave their faculty and the fact that community colleges stress that they are student centered rather than research oriented. Approximately 63 percent of the students reported they had not tried to talk to

an instructor outside of class about their academic experiences in the last two weeks. Another 2 percent explained that they had tried but that their instructors were not available. Fifteen percent of the students reported having talked to an instructor once in the last two weeks outside of class, and the remaining 20 percent of the students had talked to an instructor twice or more in the last two weeks.

There were statistically significant differences among institutions on this variable. The range of proportions of students who had never tried to talk to an instructor in the last two weeks varied across institutions from 41 percent to 81 percent. The largest proportion of students that talked to an instructor was in Quanto, a large city east coast college, and the institution that had the smallest proportion of students that talked to an instructor was the private east coast institution, Ward, where less than 20 percent of the students had talked to an instructor in the last two weeks. But generally, the range of proportions of students that talked to an instructor in the last two weeks was fairly close, for the most part varying between 35 and 45 percent of the students.

The reported lack of out-of-class faculty-student interaction was corroborated by the faculty, who reported spending only a minimal amount of their time with students outside of class. These data may be reviewed in the report on the faculty survey in this volume.

Evidently, however, the students' failure to talk with their instructors outside of class--or their instructors' failure to talk to them--had nothing to do with the instructors' lack of availability in the students' opinions. When asked how available their instructors were for consultation outside of class, 85 percent of the students reported that they were at least generally available and 50 percent reported that they were readily available for consultation outside of class (Table 5-31). Approximately 11 percent of the students reported that they had never tried to find out if their instructors were available, leaving only 4 percent that felt that their instructors were generally unavailable. The data correspond with the data reported in Table 5-30 indicating that the great majority of students considered their instructors easy to talk to outside of class.

Nevertheless highly significant differences existed among institutions in respect to instructor availability. For example, the proportions

of students that considered their instructors readily available for consultation outside of class ranged across institutions from 33 percent to 65 percent. But considering the very large proportion of students that considered their instructors either generally or readily available, the statistically significant differences are likely accounted for by the differences in proportions of students considering their instructors readily versus generally available. The institution that had the highest proportion of students (65 percent) who considered their instructors readily available for consultation outside of class was Quanto whose students, also in largest proportion (some 60 percent), reported having talked to an instructor outside of class in the last two weeks. The two institutions with the largest proportion of students who considered their instructors generally unavailable were quite disparate in characteristics: the first, Appleton (11 percent), a suburban middle-class institution and the second, Manning (7 percent), an inner-city institution with a predominately Black enrollment. Manning represents an anomaly in this case inasmuch as this institution characteristically had the largest proportion of students rating their instructors exceptionally high on a variety of items.

Evaluation of Student Personnel Services

Eighteen problems commonly faced by college students were submitted to the students sampled (item 33, Form C). They were then asked to indicate for each problem whether they needed help with it, whether they talked to their counselors about it, and if so whether they received help from their counselor. The extent to which the students reported needing help, talking to their counselor and receiving help is shown in composite form in Table 5-32. The data on needing help, talking to counselors, and receiving help are also shown in Tables 5-33 to 5-35 to facilitate comparisons of problem areas. The figures in these tables are based on the responding students. Generally between 20 to 35 percent of the students did not respond to the questions on counseling and student personnel services, suggesting that they may not have experienced them.

Selecting good classes by far predominated as the students' most commonly perceived problem. Sixty-five percent of the students reported

this as a source of concern (Table 5-33). The problems reported by the students in the next greatest proportion were future educational plans (39 percent), improving grades (34 percent), changing majors (33 percent), meaning of test scores (32 percent), and need for improving study habits (32 percent).

Relatively few students reported needing help with personal and social problems (21 percent) or family problems (12 percent)--fewer, certainly, than the counselors, themselves, who felt their students needed help in these areas (see Chapter 7). The problems with which the smallest proportions of students reported needing help were understanding the rules and procedures of their colleges (18 percent), staying in school (17 percent), finding employment after college (12 percent), and family problems (12 percent).

Without exception proportionately fewer students reported talking to counselors than reported needing help with each problem (Table 5-34); fewer still felt that the counselors were helpful (Table 5-35). For example, 28 percent of the students reported needing help with financial aid; 21 percent talked to a counselor about this problem; and 16 percent reported satisfaction with the counselor's assistance. Although there were wide ranges of students' response rates among the 15 institutions in respect to the problems indicated in item 33, no institutional patterns were obvious upon initial examination.

The small proportion of students who reported talking about problems other than selecting classes is reflected in the students' responses to item 38 of Form C which asked the continuing students to indicate how many talks or scheduled interviews they had with a counselor during a school term.

The majority of continuing students reported having an interview with their counselor no more than one time during a semester (Table 5-36). These "one-shot" interviews could have been accounted for by required programming alone and likely also account for the only problem that a majority of the students reported talking about with a counselor, selection of classes. Thirty-five percent of the students reported seeing their counselors two to four times a term, and another six percent reported seeing their counselors more than four times. Indications, therefore, are

that students had very little real exposure to counseling experiences which, as just indicated, may explain the very small percentage of students who reported talking to counselors about personal and family problems, their own self-understanding or any other problems, for that matter.

There were highly significant differences among institutions on this variable. For example, the proportions of continuing students who reported not having seen a counselor at all ranged from 3 percent to 33 percent. The largest proportion of students who had not seen a counselor were at Palmerston (33 percent) and at Ward (30 percent). The proportions of students who reported seeing their counselors two to four times a term ranged from 10 percent to 55 percent, the respective extremes being at the private institution, Ward and a rural, midwest school, Walden.

Less than 10 percent of the new students reported having not seen a counselor at all during their first term, but few had seen a counselor more than once. There were highly significant differences among institutions on this variable: 56 percent of the new students at Ward reported not seeing a counselor during their first term; 43 percent of the new students at Appleton, a middle-class urban-suburban school, reported not having seen a counselor; and 30 percent at Lowell, a large city trade/technical institution, reported the same. Seventeen percent of the students at two other colleges reported this situation to be true in contrast to two institutions with exclusively or largely Black enrollments, Manning and Foster, where all students had seen a counselor at least once.

Given the characteristics of two-year college students and their apparent need for counseling services, that so many institutions had so many students who had not seen a counselor warrants some consideration in spite of the fact that most entering students in the majority of institutions had seen a counselor at least once.

Thirty-seven percent of the students reported that it was very easy to make an appointment with the counselors at their school and 29 reported that it was not too difficult (Table 5-37). Only 5 percent of the students reported great difficulty in this respect and 17 percent had never tried. The three institutions where over 50 percent of the students reported that it was very easy to make an appointment with the counselors were schools with low minority enrollments and whose students had middle to high socioeconomic backgrounds (Newson, Quanto and Sherwood). The school with the

largest proportion of students (17 percent) reporting difficulties making counselor appointments was Manning.

But whatever the institutional differences, most of the students perceived their counselors to be accessible, which is a positive finding. The validity of the finding, however, may be questionable to this point. Most students saw a counselor only once a term, and for most of these students this was probably a required interview in order to have their academic program approved. Indications are that relatively few of the students had tried to see a counselor voluntarily, and therefore may not have really known how easy it would be to receive counseling requested on their own. But at least they felt they could, and that fact may be telling enough.

The largest proportion of the students (approximately 90 percent) at all schools reported that the length of appointment time with a counselor was either less than 15 minutes or, in the majority of cases, between 15 and 30 minutes. The generally nominal institutional differences on this variable resembles those pertaining to the ease with which students make appointments. Moreover, the slight differences among institutions that did exist were not related to the proportion of counselors in the schools.

The counseling mode perceived by a majority of students (61 percent) was that of the counselor and the student working together on the decision-making process involved (Table 5-38). Ten percent perceived their counselors as entirely directive, that is, usually telling the student what to do. Twenty-nine percent of the students considered their counselors to be basically non-directive, that is, leaving decisions entirely up to the student. There were no statistically significant differences among institutions on this variable, and, as might be anticipated, no one counseling mode prevailed exclusively in any one institution as perceived by the students.

The students were asked if their counselors had given them adequate information about careers and their academic programs. Forty-six percent of the students failed to respond to the question about careers and 37 percent did not respond to the question about academic programs, suggesting, once again, that many of the students sampled had not experienced

counseling regarding these matters.

Sixty-six percent of the students that did respond felt that their counselors had given them adequate information about occupations and careers and 78 percent reported that their counselors had given them adequate information about their academic programs (Table 5-39). These figures, however, must be judged in light of the very small proportion of students who reported talking to counselors about academic matters other than selecting classes and the even smaller proportion who reported talking to their counselors about their occupational plans (18 percent). Statistically significant differences existed across institutions on these variables. The percentage of students who reported receiving adequate information about careers and occupations ranged from 47 percent at Walden (a large mid-west city college) to 91 percent at Ward.

A considerable majority of the students rated their counselors as above average or very good on all of the descriptive traits submitted to them in item 36 of Form C: warm, informative, concerned, open-minded, intelligent, aware, easy to talk to, patient, and sympathetic (Table 5-40). Generally approximately 35 percent to 45 percent of the students rated their counselors as "very good" on these traits. Only a negligible proportion of students (approximately 3 percent) considered the counselors to be poor on these traits. In all cases, save one--counselor's patience, highly significant statistical differences existed among institutions. The proportions of students, for example, who rated their counselors as "very good" generally ranged from 20 percent to 70 percent. The counselors were rated particularly high on intelligence and their being easy to talk to. Relatively few students, however, regarded their counselors as "very good" at being sympathetic, regardless of institution. Walden was singular for the comparatively low rating given counselors.

The positive ratings given counselors corresponded with that given teachers and may, in part, reflect a halo effect, particularly in light of the little influence coming from the counselors which the students reported, and more particularly, in light of the little exposure the students had to counselors as reported above.

The students were also asked to rate their college student personnel services generally, including their counseling services. Nine stu-

dent personnel services were submitted to the students, and they were to rate each of them according to whether they considered them "strong," "average," or "weak" (item 43, Form C). The proportions of students in each institution that considered the various services as "strong" comprise composite Table 5-41. The students' more definitive responses may be found in Table 5-42.

In only one case did as much as 26 percent of the students consider a service "strong" (guidance in academic counseling) leaving the modal rating "average."

But, in only the case of three out of the nine services listed did a majority of students fail to consider the services at their school positively--either "average" or "strong"--although in each of these three cases a disproportionately high number of students expressed no opinion (between 43 and 49 percent). These three services were placement for work, special counseling for disadvantaged students, and special counseling for students with academic problems, services that the students apparently either had not requested or had not been offered. Between 11 and 23 percent of the students considered the different services "weak."

Only one of the nine items failed to distinguish among the institutions with a high level of statistical significance: the students' rating of student activities. Disproportionately high ratings of student personnel services, however, were consistently confined to 7 of the 15 institutions and for the most part to 4 of these institutions. This could be due to some systematic difference in quality of student personnel services as perceived by students or, possibly, to the availability of counseling time for student problems. As there was no direct relationship among schools between enrollment size and the number of counselors on the staff, the students' opinions of their colleges' student personnel services may reflect quantity as well as quality of the student personnel services.

College Preference

As an additional means of obtaining the students' commitment to and evaluation of their colleges they were asked to indicate if they were now attending the college of their choice, and what college they would

have attended if they could have picked any college that they wanted (Table 5-43).

Although 83 percent of the students reported that they were "now attending" the college of their choice, ideally only 53 percent would have chosen their present college, and 3 percent would have picked another junior college. Forty-four percent of the students would have preferred to attend a four-year college or university. The variation in proportions of students who would have ideally chosen the colleges they were attending ranged by institution from 38 percent to 82 percent.

The lowest two proportions of students preferring the school they were now attending were located at Quanto and Walden, large midwest and eastern city colleges with an emphasis on transfer programs. Institutions whose students in the largest proportions indicated they wanted to be there were located in relatively small cities and enrolled predominantly middle-class Caucasian students. However, although there were institutional differences on this variable, precise reasons for them were not clear. Perhaps the more important finding is that a very large segment of the students attending two-year colleges would prefer to be in a senior college, regardless of the specific type of two-year college they were attending, but that most of them seemed to be satisfied with their second choice.

CHAPTER 6

FACULTY PROFILES

Much, if not most, of the commitment community junior colleges have to their diverse students is dependent upon their faculty. Therefore, it is important to know the preparation the faculty have for this commitment, how they go about it, and their opinions about it. For this reason the faculty in the 15 institutions studied were asked a variety of questions regarding the following topics: (1) their personal characteristics; (2) their socioeconomic background; (3) their educational background; (4) their occupational background; (5) their current professional status; (6) their current professional activities, including their approach to instruction and student evaluation, and their evaluation of their college; and (7) their opinions about their colleges' educational priorities and the educational priorities for junior colleges generally.

Faculty differences on these variables among institutions were confined only to a few measurements because of limited time and funds. These measurements, however, include a variety of items since they were based on the factor analyses reported in Volume III of The Study of Junior Colleges. The tables referred to in this chapter are contained in Appendix D of Volume II A: Technical Appendixes.

Personal Characteristics

Demographic Information

The faculty members were not particularly youthful. Sixteen percent of them were under the age of 30 compared to the majority who were between 30 and 50 years of age (59 percent). Over 26 percent were over 50 years of age. The fact that the large proportion of the faculty members were middle-aged (40 years of age or more) may reflect the practice of recruiting tenured high school teachers for junior college teaching positions rather than recruiting personnel fresh out of graduate school.

Seventy percent of the faculty were men. Although the junior college faculty was dominated by men, the 30 percent of the women in the

15 institutions surveyed represents more than is found in four-year colleges and universities.

The faculty were also primarily Caucasian (90 percent). Seven percent were Black, 1 percent Mexican-American, 1 percent Oriental, 0.6 percent Puerto Rican, and 0.4 percent American Indian. The 7 percent of the Black faculty, no doubt, was accounted for by the very few institutions, and particularly one institution, that had heavy enrollments of Black students and had recruited a number of Black faculty to work with these students. This means that, by and large, the community colleges surveyed have recruited very few minority faculty.

A number of the faculty, however, reported living in racially mixed neighborhoods. Twenty percent reported that over 10 percent of the population in their neighborhoods were Black. Seventeen percent reported that over 10 percent of the population in their neighborhoods had Spanish surnames and 5 percent reported that over 10 percent of the population in their neighborhoods were Oriental. Of course these could be overlapping figures; that is, the same individuals may have been reporting data for Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Orientals simultaneously. Moreover, these figures may well be a reflection of a location of the faculty members' colleges rather than any other factor.

The faculty members reported living in neighborhoods characterized by upper middle incomes. Three percent reported living in neighborhoods with an average family income of \$3,000 to \$6,000. Another 23 percent reported living in neighborhoods where the average family income was between \$6,000 and \$10,000, leaving the remainder living in neighborhoods with an average family income above the national median. Thirty-two percent of the faculty lived in neighborhoods where the average family income was over \$15,000, a figure well over the national median.

Community Involvement

The faculty members manifested a considerable amount of interest in their communities' civic affairs as indicated by their responses to the question: "In what activities have you engaged during the past year in the community served by your college?" Twelve activities were specified. Over 80 percent of the faculty followed local events regularly in their newspaper, voted in the last local election, talked about local community problems with their friends, and gave money to their community funds,

trusts, or other local charities. Fifty-six percent belonged to a community organization interested in civic affairs such as the PTA, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, and business or professional associations. Between 34 and 47 percent had contact with a local official about some community problem, attended meetings of some local civic group, and contributed time or money to some civic project such as a playground, park, school, hospital, or theatre. Twenty-eight percent collected money, called on their neighbors, carried a petition, or engaged in some similar activity on behalf of a local community project; and 10 percent actually participated in a demonstration or protest about a local issue. Another 8 percent indicated some community activity they were engaged in other than those specified in the questionnaire.

Indications are, then, that the community college faculty were indeed quite involved with the communities around them, certainly in terms of taking an interest in exercising their voting privileges, and, on the part of many, in terms of very direct activities as well.

Viewpoints on Social Issues

The faculty were asked whether they agreed with, disagreed with, or had no opinion about 15 positions taken regarding various contemporary social issues (item 52, Appendix D). Only with respect to the first statement, having to do with limiting government planning, did as much as 21 percent express no opinion. A majority (between 79 and 94 percent) agreed with the following three positions: that professional women should have the same benefits as their male colleagues; that married women with young children should be allowed to follow their own interests; and that issues such as law, order, civil rights, and public demonstrations are complex and need careful evaluation. They disagreed with two positions: that literature should not question the basic moral concepts of society, and that parents know as much about teaching children as teachers.

There was considerable diversity of opinion on the remaining ten positions, although a majority of faculty either agreed or disagreed with each position except that on government planning; their agreement was usually in what might be regarded a more "liberal" direction, depending

on the wording of the statements.

A factor analysis of responses to these statements yielded five distinct factors, three of which were more immediately interpretable. The first, Restriction of Civil Rights, polarized those who took a laissez-faire attitude towards the disadvantaged, who advocated American might over other nations, and who would restrict the rights of women and college speakers advocating unpopular causes. This factor comprises statements 11, 15, 13, 9, 12, and 2 of item 52.

The second factor, Restriction of Women, polarized those who would restrict the roles and rights of women in the professions, public policy, and marriage. It included statements 8, 7 and 10. The third factor, Restriction of Government, polarized those who would severely limit government planning and the binding power of the United Nations. It included statements 1 and 3.

Factor scores were derived from the faculty members' responses to the statements and then standardized so that 0 represents the mean for the total sample and two-thirds of the scores fall between -1 and +1 (or between plus and minus 1 standard deviation). Analyses of variance were then conducted to determine institutional differences in the faculty's scores. The resultant F ratios, range of mean standard scores across the 15 institutions, and the three lowest scoring and three highest scoring institutions are shown in Table 6-1.

All three scales discriminated among the institutions statistically, although Restriction of Women's Rights did not reach the one percent level of significance. Restriction of Civil Rights was particularly discriminating. The range of scores varied from approximately $2/3$ to $1\ 1/2$ standard deviations. The higher the scores the greater restrictiveness indicated.

On two of the three scales Lowell and Palmerston were among the institutions with the three highest mean scores. Manning, Foster, and Quanto were among the three institutions with the lowest scores on two scales. These data suggest a great amount of consistency of faculty responses on the three scales. But this consistency is not universal as indicated by the fact that both Sherwood and Shaw were among the three highest scoring institutions on one scale and among the three lowest

scoring institutions on another. The data also further reflects a great mix of "liberalism" and "conservatism" among the faculty.

The faculty members as a whole, therefore, were middle-aged Caucasian men who took a fairly active interest, at least in some ways, in the affairs of their communities. They lived in a diversity of neighborhoods as determined by family income, but tended to live in "average" to somewhat "above average" neighborhoods. Although they were also diverse in their viewpoints on social issues, they tended toward "liberal" positions. Questions that remain are what effect would result from having more women on the faculty, and what effect those faculty members unsympathetic to the plight of the disadvantaged have on their own disadvantaged students.

Socioeconomic Status

Religion

The religious background of the faculty was predominantly Protestant. Sixty-five percent of the faculty members' fathers and 67 percent of their mothers were Protestant. Over 20 percent of their fathers and mothers were Catholic, and 5 percent Jewish. There was some "liberalizing" phenomenon apparent among the faculty members when it came to their own religious affiliation. Eighteen percent reported they had no religion compared to 7 percent of their fathers and 3 percent of their mothers. This difference is largely accounted for, no doubt, by the reduction in the proportion of faculty members who reported themselves to be Protestant compared to their parents. Fifty-four percent reported themselves to be Protestant compared to over 65 percent of their parents who were Protestant. Twenty percent reported themselves to be Catholic, 4 percent Jewish, and 4 percent other, figures that compare quite closely with those of their parents.

Books

Indications are that the faculty members did not come from families that were avid readers of books. The vast majority reported that there were less than 100 books in their homes. In fact, 38 percent reported that there were less than 50 books in their homes. Only 23 percent

reported that there were over 200 books in their homes. Inasmuch as the possession of books is an indicator of one's cultural background, as has been confirmed by considerable previous research, the conjecture here is that the majority of the junior college faculty members surveyed came from a relatively circumscribed cultural background.

Parents' Occupations and Education

The faculty's limited cultural background is further corroborated upon examination of the occupations and education of their parents. Although their fathers spanned a wide range of occupations when the faculty members were 17 years old, only 22 percent of their fathers held managerial or professional positions which would require at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in experience and responsibility. The majority of their fathers were either semi- or unskilled workers (23 percent), skilled craftsmen (18 percent), or owners or managers of a small business (17 percent).

The majority of the faculty reported that when they were 17 years old their mothers were housewives. Eight percent of their mothers were professional and most of the remaining mothers were semi- or unskilled workers (10 percent) or skilled workers (7 percent).

The fact that most of the faculty members had attained a college education was a departure from the opportunities or choices of their parents. In fact, approximately 45 percent of both of the faculty members' parents had failed to complete high school. Approximately 12 percent of the parents at the other end of the educational spectrum had had some college and 16 percent had at least obtained a bachelor's degree. Considering that less than one-fourth of the faculty members' parents had professional positions and that just a little over one-fourth of their parents had any college experience, the faculty members themselves could be considered quite upwardly mobile in reference to their parents.

To reiterate, the faculty members surveyed were predominantly Caucasian, middle-aged men with Protestant and relatively low socioeconomic backgrounds in terms of books, education, and careers possessed by their parents.

Educational Background

A large number of the faculty members experienced the junior college from both the perspective of student and teacher. Thirty-eight percent had attended a junior college and another 7 percent had attended a two-year technical institute, meaning that 45 percent had attended some type of two-year college.

Twenty percent of the faculty had actually attained an Associate of Arts degree, mostly, but not exclusively, at a junior college. Most (73 percent) had a master's degree which is to be expected since at least the faculty teaching transfer courses are expected to have a master's degree in the junior college. Eleven percent reported that they had a doctoral degree. Nineteen percent, on the other hand, indicated that they did not have a bachelor's degree. This latter figure is no doubt reasonable since a number of the faculty teaching trade/technical or vocational programs are recruited for their technical knowledge and experience more than for their academic credentials.

When asked in what year they received their highest degree, a definite majority replied that they received their highest degree between 1960 and 1972 (63 percent). Five percent reported receiving their highest degree prior to 1940 and 32 percent reported receiving their highest degree between 1941 and 1959. A surprising 37 percent did not indicate the year in which they received their highest degree. However, on the basis of those who did respond to the item indications are that they obtained their highest degree--for the most part a master's degree--relatively recently. This fact is curious in light of their age distribution. Considering that the majority were 40 years old or more, one might have expected that they would have attained their master's degrees earlier than 1960.

A number of the faculty were currently working toward further educational attainment: 3 percent were currently working toward a bachelor's degree; 7 percent toward a master's degree; and 20 percent toward a doctoral degree. The largest proportions of faculty currently engaged in academic work of their own were doing so in the fields of education (32 percent), humanities (14 percent), and the social sciences (13 percent).

Eighteen percent reported that they had also completed requirements or were taking courses toward an administrative, counseling, or other non-teaching position. Eight percent indicated they had actually completed these requirements and another 10 percent were working toward their completion. Those who had completed or were working toward these requirements were doing so predominantly in administrative areas.

Junior college administrators commonly state that they do not like to hire faculty with Ph.D. degrees for fear that their presumed concomitant research interests will interfere with their concentrating on teaching students, the primary function of junior colleges. Documentation is lacking confirming this position, but the position, itself, is reflected by the educational level of the faculty surveyed. The position, of course, warrants examination, especially since current signs are that newly graduated students with doctoral degrees are increasingly seeking out positions in junior colleges because of the limited positions open in four-year colleges and universities.

Likewise, more information is needed on the 20 percent of the faculty who reported they were currently working on doctoral degrees. Some, no doubt, will not complete their work. Some were probably preparing for administrative positions. But what are the reasons for obtaining a doctoral degree for the others, and what will be the effects of having these degrees on their teaching and their careers?

Occupational Background

Academic Employment

Data on the current status of the faculty, to be presented below, indicate that the vast majority surveyed were hired by their college or district within the last ten years. This is further reflected by the fact that over 50 percent reported that they had been a junior college teacher no more than five years, and less than 20 percent reported that they had been teaching in a junior college more than ten years. In light of current recruitment patterns and needs in higher education it may be of interest to note that only 10 percent reported that they had been a

junior college teacher between one and two years.

When asked in item 37, "Have you had work experience in education prior to your current position?", 77 percent of the faculty reported that they had. As indicated in Table 6-2, this experience was primarily no more than five years, was predominantly a teaching position, and took place predominantly in secondary schools. Fifty-five percent with previous educational experience taught in secondary schools. Some faculty members, however, reported having taught in one or another of every type of institution from elementary school to the university level. Following secondary schools, the largest to the smallest proportions with prior experience reported having taught at a junior college, primarily public (20 percent), a university, predominantly public (26 percent), a four-year college (18 percent), at some other unspecified type of educational institution other than traditional schools and colleges (15 percent), and at an elementary school (13 percent).

A few of the faculty with prior educational experience reported having been counselors prior to their present position (7 percent), primarily in high schools; and a few reported a prior administrative experience (17 percent), again mostly in high schools, with the exception of institutions other than traditional schools and colleges.

Non-academic Employment

A number of the faculty also reported prior work experience outside of education (item 38). Between 15 and 25 percent reported that they had prior experience as a general worker (or common laborer), a semi-skilled worker, a skilled clerical or sales worker, a skilled craftsman or foreman, or a semi-professional or technician. Approximately 10 percent reported that they had prior work experience as a protective service worker such as a policeman, military man or fireman, owner or manager of a small business firm, and a high level professional such as a physician or lawyer. The largest proportion reporting previous non-educational work experiences (32 percent) reported positions at the lower level managerial and professional occupations such as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, engineer, or certified public accountant. Three percent reported having worked prior to the present position as a farm

owner or manager.

Of the faculty who reported they had worked as unskilled, semi-skilled, or skilled clerical or sales positions, a considerable majority did so for no more than three years. Between 44 and 47 percent of those who reported working in protective service, owner or manager, farm owner or manager, or semi-professional positions worked no more than three years. Thus, the vast majority of the faculty members worked at their previous non-educational positions for no more than ten years and the modal trend was to work for no more than three years.

The major exception was those who reported having skilled craftsman or foreman positions. Forty-five percent of this group worked in this capacity for more than ten years. Approximately 36 percent who had high or low managerial and professional positions also worked for more than ten years at these positions. Quite likely the skilled craftsman or foreman were those who were part of the trade/technical faculty in the colleges.

More needs to be known about those who had non-educational, professional positions before they entered the two-year college. No doubt, also, there is some overlap among the responses. Therefore, the data need to be further manipulated to determine exactly what proportion of the faculty overall worked in non-educational positions at what capacity and at what period of time. But perhaps what is most important to know is what contribution this prior experience has brought to the colleges where they are now teaching. The evidence at this point is that a sizeable number have had work experience in non-educational situations. The hope is that these experiences will widen horizons of those many students entering community colleges whose visions are very limited in this respect.

As for the previous educational experiences of the faculty surveyed, in sum over 50 percent of them had come from elementary or secondary schools, primarily from secondary schools and primarily in teaching capacities. Twenty-three percent had had no prior educational experience professionally. The remainder came primarily from four-year colleges and universities. Of the 743 faculty members surveyed, 569 indicated that they had work experience in education prior to their current position.

The fact that the tally of faculty members who indicated having a specific position in various types of educational institutions totalled 854 indicates that many of them worked at more than one type of institution and/or more than one type of position prior to their present position. The most important finding, however, appears to be that relatively few faculty members are trained especially for a position in the two-year college, but rather come from other professional backgrounds.

Current Status

Job Securance and Motivation

Just as the last decade (1961-1972) represented the period when most of the faculty surveyed obtained their last degree, so also did it represent a period of placement for the vast majority of them. Eighty-two percent reported that they were hired by their district or institution during this time period. Only 5 percent reported being hired prior to 1950, leaving 14 percent who were hired between 1951 and 1960.

The faculty members reported two paramount sources for learning about their present position: first, by direct or indirect contact with someone employed by their institution (44 percent) and second, by self-initiated application (34 percent). Seven percent reported learning about their present position through college placement services, 3 percent through a professional organization such as a teachers' association, and 1 percent by notice of vacancy sent to a previous employer. Another 11 percent reported miscellaneous sources of information about their present position.

When asked to indicate their first, second, and third most important reasons for choosing their college (item 34), the dominant reason they gave was the fact that they wanted to teach at a college level (43 percent). This was followed as the most important reason by the fact that it was the best job offer at the time (12 percent), and by the fact that their college offered them a stimulating environment (12 percent). Next in order of first importance were the respondents' dissatisfaction with their previous positions (6 percent), the fact that friends were at their institution (5 percent), the salary (3 percent), and the fact that they needed a job while they were earning a higher

degree (3 percent). Nine percent of the responding faculty reported a variety of other reasons as the most important reason for their choosing their junior college.

The second and third most important reasons for choosing their junior college were, in order: the fact that the college was a desirable location, their salary, the fact that they needed a job while earning a higher degree, the fact that they wanted to teach at a college level, and the fact that their college provided them a stimulating environment.

Many faculty members, however, did not give a reason for choosing their college. Between 20 to 34 percent of the faculty did not respond to the first, second, and third most important reasons respectively.

Teaching Status

Only 13 percent of the faculty reported teaching part time which may be a positive finding in light of previous research which has demonstrated a negative correlation between part-time faculty and educational quality of collegiate institutions. A larger proportion of part-time faculty members might have been expected, however, considering the extensive extended day programs and trade/technical and other vocational programs in community junior colleges which reasonably might only require part-time faculty.

A majority of the faculty (58 percent) reported working days only. An apparently large proportion (31 percent), however, reported working both days and nights, leaving 11 percent that reported working nights only and who might well be the bulk of those who were part time. Similarly, a large proportion of the relatively small group who reported working days and nights might well be those who reported working additional hours beyond those considered part of their regular duties at their institution. Forty-three percent reported working additional hours, mostly at their own institution.

Apparently almost all of the institutions grant tenure or security of employment to their faculty. Sixty-six percent indicated that they had tenure in contrast to only 35 percent who said that they did not.

When asked to indicate the fields in which they were now teaching, over two-thirds of the faculty reported that they were teaching in the

traditional academic areas, with less than one-third teaching in vocational areas. For some inexplicable reason, however, 22 percent of the faculty failed to report the field in which they were teaching in contrast to the general non-response rate of 2 to 3 percent to any item in the survey questionnaire. Of the 15 specific teaching areas listed, most of the respondents were teaching in the humanities (18 percent), the social sciences (15 percent), trade-technical courses (15 percent), the physical sciences (12 percent), or business (11 percent). Six percent reported that they were teaching in two or three subject areas.

Thus, the prevailing profile of the faculty's status was a group that had begun working at their institution within the last ten years prior to the survey; that had been contacted for their position by their institution or who had applied for their position on their own; that chose their college because they wanted to teach at a college level; that taught full time and worked extra hours beyond their regular duties; that had tenure; and that taught in academic areas.

Faculty Activities and Instruction

Activities and Time Allocation

When asked which courses they primarily teach, 35 percent of the faculty members reported teaching occupational/vocational courses which corresponds quite closely to the 33 percent that reported their major teaching areas to be in the vocational/technical areas as indicated above. Sixty-one percent reported teaching primarily transfer or general education courses and 4 percent reported that they primarily taught remedial or developmental courses. Eleven percent did not respond to this item.

The faculty members in the survey were asked in item 29, "If you teach at this institution as part of your regular assignment, how many hours a week do you spend in the following activities?" The responses to this question warrant scrutiny. Seventy percent replied that they spent between 6 and 20 hours a week in class, 15 percent between 1 to 5 hours, and another 15 percent over 20 hours.

Likely lab instructors and vocational instructors who do not have a great deal of out-of-class examinations or preparation to take care

of were those who spent over 20 hours in class. No doubt, too, those who reported spending 5 hours or less in class have other duties since some 21 percent of the faculty reported having administrative duties and 18 percent reported being involved in other teaching-related activities.

But regardless of these circumstances, those faculty members who reported spending so very few hours and those who spent more than 12 or 16 hours in class warrant serious attention. There first is the question of how much time those who have heavy class schedules are able to spend with their students and their own development. Second, there is a question of what those with very light schedules do with their time outside of class.

Thirty-eight percent of the faculty reported spending between zero to 5 hours in preparing materials for their class. Thirty-five percent reported spending 6 to 10 hours a week in this activity. Sixteen percent reported spending 11 to 15 hours, and 11 percent reported spending more than 16 hours preparing materials for class. The diversity on this dimension is immense and may reflect diversity in the nature of the classes, also a diversity in the nature of the individual instructors and how they go about preparing for their classes regardless of subject content. Although the students were very sanguine in their evaluation of their faculty members on the whole, there certainly seems to be a need to correlate preparation time with objective measures of teaching effectiveness on the basis of these data.

When asked how much time they spend on such activities as correcting exams, reports, and written assignments, 11 percent of the faculty reported spending no time at all during a given week, and 58 percent reported spending between 1 to 5 hours in these activities, meaning that nearly 70 percent reported spending no more than 5 hours in going over students' work. Twenty-three percent reported spending 6 to 10 hours a week in this activity and 8 percent over 10 hours.

Fifteen percent reported spending no time at all during the week, and 63 percent reported spending 1 to 5 hours a week. This means that nearly 80 percent reportedly spent no more than 5 hours a week with their students. This finding also merits attention particularly since the junior college is a validly student-oriented college where it is known

that there are a great number of diverse students with individual needs that could not possibly be handled within the classroom setting.

Very few faculty reported spending time supervising student activities such as clubs and social events. Eighty percent spent no time at all, 9 percent only spent 1 hour a week, and only 11 percent spent more than 2 hours a week on these activities, indicating that they were not interacting very much with their students outside of class whether through individual conferences or student activities.

Neither did they spend a great deal of time on committee meetings related to institutional functioning such as departmental, budget, or curricular meetings. Thirty percent reportedly spent no time, 25 percent spent no more than 1 hour a week, and 29 percent spent no more than 2 to 3 hours a week on committee meetings. Only 16 percent spent as many as 4 hours a week on these meetings.

A few faculty members reported spending some time on extramural professional activities. Sixteen percent reported spending 1 hour a week on activities involving professional teacher organizations, and 8 percent reported spending 2 hours or more on these activities.

Thus, the faculty members reported essentially two activities: classroom teaching and preparing materials for class. Relatively little time was spent on going over students' materials outside of class and still less time interacting with students outside of class, whether in a conference or organized activity situation.

As indicated previously, the faculty members were asked if they worked additional hours beyond those considered part of their regular duties at their institution. Forty-three percent replied that they did, and of these the greatest proportion reported carrying out extra teaching loads at their own institution or working extra hours in a non-teaching position. Putting the matter another way, of the 743 faculty members surveyed, 304 reported they worked beyond their regular duties at their institution. Of the 304 faculty members who reported that they carried out an extra teaching load, 121 did so at their institution. This constituted 60 percent of the 304 faculty members reporting holding an extra job. Eighty-eight of the 304 faculty members (29 percent) reported teaching at some institution other than their own in addition to

their regular job. The 88 faculty members reporting this situation scattered themselves across several kinds of institutions including secondary or elementary schools, four-year colleges and universities, other junior colleges, technical institutes, and miscellaneous institutions.

As indicated in item 30 C, 48 percent of the faculty reported working extra hours each week in a non-teaching position. Upon consideration of all those who reported working at various teaching and non-teaching situations, it is apparent that some of the faculty were working extra hours at both types of positions.

Of those teaching extra hours at their own institution, 29 percent reported working three hours per week and 19 percent four hours or more in a classroom. Nine percent reported working three hours per week and 14 percent reported spending four hours or more each week preparing for their classes outside their regular duties. Thus, the sizeable group that reported working extra hours at their own institution spent relatively few hours either in class or preparing for their classes.

This is not the story, however, of those who reported working extra hours each week in non-teaching positions. Forty percent of this group reported working 6 to 20 hours per week outside of their regular duties and 35 percent reported working more than 20 hours each week in their non-regular, non-teaching positions.

The evidence is, therefore, that a significant proportion of the faculty surveyed held a job outside of their regular position, and those that had non-teaching jobs spent considerable time at them beyond their regular teaching duties. Moreover, those that held teaching or non-teaching jobs beyond their regular duties could not be accounted for by the 13 percent of the faculty that reported teaching part time.

Approach to Instruction

Item 42 requested the faculty to respond to the question, "Which are the three most important qualifications you think a junior college instructor should have?" By way of response, the faculty members were asked to indicate what they felt were the first, second, and third most important qualifications. They were clearly selective in their perceptions of requisite qualifications.

Forty percent of those responding checked that "demonstrated interest in student problems and activities" was the most important qualification

for a junior college instructor to have; 19 percent checked a "wide range of work experience other than teaching;" and 23 percent checked "teaching experience at the junior college level." The faculty members that checked one of these items comprised 82 percent of the respondents.

The pattern of responses was consistent across the three categories of qualifications. Therefore, the faculty members' ranking of the seven specified qualifications was determined by averaging the proportions of the faculty across the three response categories for each specified qualification. The ranking of the qualifications follows from the most frequently endorsed category to the least:

1. demonstrated interest in student problems and activities
2. teaching experience at the junior college level
3. wide range of work experience other than teaching
4. teaching experience at the elementary or secondary level
5. outstanding undergraduate or graduate academic record
6. demonstrated scholarly work
7. teaching experience at a four-year institution.

That teaching experience at a four-year institution would be the lowest ranked qualification for a junior college instructor is understandable since presumably experience at the two-year college level would be a more profitable, relevant background for further teaching at that level. This may be true, especially given the differences in the nature of the students at the two types of institutions. Some questions might be raised, however, about demonstrated scholarly work and outstanding academic records as being the next lowest ranked qualifications. It is true that the junior college is not a research-oriented institution. But inasmuch as the main function of the faculty members at the junior college is teaching, one might argue that good academic performance and demonstrated scholarly interests reflect good teaching and are important to the teaching function.

The top-ranked qualification, "demonstrated interest in student problems and activities," is compatible with the avowed primary orientation of two-year colleges. The faculty members' stress on this qualification represents somewhat of an anomaly, however, particularly in light of their responses to the question regarding the way they spend their time. As indicated above, relatively few faculty members reported

spending much time at all with their students outside of the formal classroom. This was the case especially in reference to student activities. In view of the fact that the faculty members stressed the importance of interaction with students and yet reported comparatively little time spent with students out of class suggests that they espoused the principle of student orientation without demonstrating commensurate practice of the principle.

In addition to the faculty members' opinions about prerequisite qualifications for junior college instructors, they were asked about their own instructional practices. Item 31 questioned, "How often do you use the following instructional techniques?" Eight techniques were specified, and the faculty were to indicate for each of them whether they used the technique "regularly", "occasionally", or "seldom or never."

Only three instructional techniques were used regularly by as many as half the faculty. These were the lecture (68 percent), instructor-led discussions (62 percent), and class drills or quizzes (49 percent). Forty percent reported regular use of individual projects and reports and 36 percent reported regular use of audio-visual techniques. Otherwise, less than 25 percent reported the regular use of any other instructional technique including small group discussions, group projects and reports, and miscellaneous instructional techniques and auto-tutorial techniques.

Although individualized instruction through auto-tutorial techniques has been discussed extensively as one of the main innovative thrusts in junior college education, only 10 percent reported regular use of these techniques. Even fewer reported any other type of instructional technique under the miscellaneous category, innovative or not. Indeed, 64 percent reported that they "seldom or never" used auto-tutorial techniques. The technique next to auto-tutorial devices that was least popular was group projects and reports. Thirty-four percent reported that they "seldom or never" use that particular technique. Between 26 and 49 percent reported the occasional use of these various techniques. All in all, then, apparently the faculty in the colleges surveyed relied most heavily upon the most traditional instructional techniques.

Indications are that the faculty were as traditional in their methods of evaluating their students as in teaching them (item 32). As in the

question regarding instructional techniques, the faculty members were given nine specified evaluation techniques and asked to indicate for each of them whether they used the technique "regularly", "occasionally", or "seldom or never."

The primary methods for evaluating the students were final examinations, regularly used by 84 percent of the faculty, quizzes (69 percent), mid-term examinations (63 percent), and class or laboratory projects (54 percent). The least popular methods of evaluation included the students' own written work: 36 percent of the faculty reported regular use of students' short written reports for evaluation; 21 percent reported the regular use of term papers; and 14 percent reported the regular use of book reports. Fifty percent or more reported that they seldom or never used students' term papers or book reports to evaluate them. This finding might be contrasted to the fact that 40 percent of the faculty reported that they regularly used attendance in class as a method of evaluating their students for their final grade.

Another way of looking at the matter is that only 7 percent reported using final examinations "seldom or never" and 10 percent reported using quizzes "seldom or never," in contrast to 48 percent who reported using term papers "seldom or never" and 61 percent who reported using book reports "seldom or never."

Definitive judgments cannot be made about the relative worth of the different methods in evaluating students. Nevertheless, the lack of emphasis placed on students' written communication may warrant consideration in the context of the record of transfer students. Generally junior college students who transfer to a senior college achieve a lower grade point average than students who have attended a four-year college or university from the beginning. This is often true, at least, for the first term after transference, indicating that community college students may not be sufficiently prepared for the heavy written work that they are accountable for in upper division classes of four-year colleges and universities.

Along with this possibility, several other findings regarding the faculty's activities and instruction have serious implications. The faculty considered interest in students' problems and activities as the most important qualification for a junior college instructor and yet they reported spending a minimum of time with them outside of class. This may preclude

giving the individual attention needed by so many of the junior colleges' diverse students with special problems. A large number of faculty reported working extra hours in both teaching and non-teaching positions, which may preclude their giving their full commitment to their regular jobs. Finally, they reported following traditional instructional and student evaluation techniques which may mitigate the innovative thrust advocated by many leaders in the junior college movement.

Faculty's Evaluation of Their Colleges

Effort was made to learn the faculty members' attitudes about their colleges, and the nature and dynamics of the colleges from their perspectives. Consequently comprehensive questions were asked the faculty related to the following topics: (1) their perceptions of their colleges' environments; (2) the benefits their students were receiving compared to the benefits they should receive; (3) the benefits their communities were and should receive from their colleges; (4) evaluation of major characteristics of their students; (5) their evaluation of their colleges' student personnel services; (6) how they would allocate administrative and management responsibilities; (7) the control their colleges should exert over student behavior; (8) their satisfaction with major elements of their colleges; (9) their choice of institutional employment; and (10) the types of colleges that they would prefer their own children to attend.

College Environments

An abridged version of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) was submitted to the faculty (see Pace, 1969). The abridgment included 4 of the most discriminating items from the 5 original 20-item scales measuring various aspects of the college environment from the perspective of the respondents. Each scale contains descriptive statements about the college environment and the respondent is to indicate whether he thinks the statement is a generally true or generally false description of his own college. The aggregate proportions of the faculty that either endorsed or rejected each statement may be found under item 49 of Appendix D. The responses were not scored in the usual manner; rather factor scores were obtained, as discussed below, and discussed in more detail in Volume III of The Study of Junior Colleges.

The faculty exhibited consensus and division of opinion about evenly, depending upon the statement. The first four statements are intended as a measure of the practical aspects of the college environment. A considerable majority felt that frequent tests are given in most courses and that their colleges offer many really practical courses. But they were divided in their opinions as to whether the most important people at their schools expect proper respect and as to whether there is a recognized group of student leaders on their campuses.

Statements 5 to 8 provide an index of the Community scale. A considerable majority disagreed with the statement that upperclassmen are active in helping new students, but agreed that the professors go out of their way to help students and that their school has a reputation for being friendly. They were divided in their opinions as to whether students find it easy to get together for recreational purposes.

Statements 9 to 12, drawn from the Awareness scale, are intended to serve as an index of a college's intellectual climate. The faculty were somewhat divided in opinion about all four statements. A majority, however, felt that students are encouraged to criticize administrative and teaching practices. A majority rejected the statements that their schools offer many opportunities for students to appreciate art, music, and drama; that their students are actively concerned about national and international affairs; and that many famous people are brought to perform at their schools.

Items 13 to 16 are intended to indicate the amount of propriety perceived as part of a college's environment. A clear majority of the faculty rejected all four of the statements in this scale having to do with students taking good care of school property, reporting violations of rules, asking permission before deviating from common procedures, and never lampooning dignified people or institutions in their publications.

The final four statements (17 to 20) were derived from the Scholarship scale. A majority of the faculty felt that most courses at their college provide a real intellectual challenge and that careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in evaluating students' work. A majority rejected the statements, however, that students set high standards of achievement for themselves and that most courses require intensive study and preparation outside of class.

Thus, on the basis of these accrued responses, the faculty members in total tended to see their colleges' environments as relatively high in Practicality and Community and relatively low in Awareness and Propriety. They were most mixed in their responses to the Scholarship statements.

Factor analysis of the faculty's responses to the 20 statements yielded six factors. The four most dominant factors very closely correspond with the abridged CUES Awareness, Propriety, Community, and Scholarship scales. Statement 9 of item 49 was dropped from the Awareness scale; statement 14 was dropped from the Propriety scale; statement 6 was dropped from the Community scale and statement 4 of the Practicality scale was added to it; statement 18 was dropped from the Scholarship scale and statement 1 from the Practicality scale was added to it. Otherwise the original scales remained intact.

The Student Benefits scale included statement 2, from the original Practicality scale, that the college offers many really practical courses; statement 6, from the Community scale, that the professors go out of their way to help students; statement 9, from the Awareness scale, that students are encouraged to criticize their colleges' administrative and teaching practices; statement 10, also from the Awareness scale, that the schools offer many opportunities for students to appreciate art, music, and drama.

The Institutional Rigidity scale included two statements: statement 14, from the original Propriety scale, that students are expected to report any violations of rules and regulations; and statement 3, from the Practicality scale, that the most important people at the schools expect proper respect.

Standard scores were derived from these scales, in the manner discussed in respect to Table 6-1 regarding the faculty's viewpoint on social issues. Again the total mean equals 0 and the standard deviation equals 1. Analysis of variance of the scores indicated striking differences among the 15 institutions under study (Table 6-3). The F ratios ranged from 3.50 (Awareness) to 14.83 (Propriety). The standard mean scores ranged from approximately 1 to nearly 2 standard deviations.

Langston was among the three lowest scoring institutions on five of the six scales, excluding only Student Benefits. Lowell was among the three lowest scoring institutions on Awareness and Student Benefits; Foster on

Propriety and Community; Walden on Community and Student Benefits; and Sherwood on Propriety, Scholarship and Institutional Rigidity. Ward was among the three lowest scoring institutions on Student Benefits and Kinsey on Institutional Rigidity.

There was also considerable consistency of colleges placing among the three highest scoring institutions on the six scales. Manning was among the three highest scoring institutions on Awareness, Community, and Institutional Rigidity; Sherwood on Awareness and Student Benefits; Palmerston on Propriety, Institutional Rigidity, and .01 point below third-ranked Meade on Scholarship (not shown in Table 6-3); Kinsey on Propriety and Student Benefits; and Shaw on Propriety and Scholarship. Other colleges among the three highest scoring institutions were Walden on Awareness; Newson and Quanto on Community; Ward and Meade on Scholarship; Carter on Student Benefits; and Lowell on Institutional Rigidity. Sherwood was singular for being over represented among both the highest and lowest scoring institutions on the six scales, just as it was on the Faculty Viewpoint scales.

Student Outcomes

The faculty members were presented with 17 educational benefits commonly held as outcomes important to both students and society (item 40A). In each case they were asked to indicate whether the students do and whether they should receive "very much" of the benefits, "some", or "little or none" of the benefits.

For the most part a majority felt that the students should receive "very much" of the specified benefits. The exceptions were broadened literary acquaintance and appreciation (40 percent), aesthetic sensitivity (appreciation and enjoyment of art, music, and drama, 40 percent), understanding and appreciation of science and technology (46 percent), development of friendships and loyalties of lasting value (35 percent), and appreciation of religion (moral and ethical standards, 24 percent).

Over 70 percent of the faculty felt that their students should receive "very much" of the following benefits: vocational training (skills and techniques directly applicable to jobs); personal development (understanding one's abilities, limitations, interests, and standards of behavior); and writing and speaking skills (clear, correct, effective communication).

Between 60 and 70 percent felt that students should receive "very much" of the following: critical thinking (logic, inference, natures and limitations of knowledge); appreciation of individuality and independence of thought and action; and tolerance and understanding of other people and their values.

Eighteen percent felt that their students should receive little or no appreciation of religion, that is, moral and ethical standards, as a result of their education. Otherwise, for the most part no more than 2 percent felt that their students should receive little or none of the specified educational benefits, meaning that almost all of the faculty felt that their students should at least receive some of all the educational benefits enumerated.

Their perceptions of what their students were actually receiving, however, differed radically from what they felt they should receive. A majority of the faculty (60 percent) felt that their students received "very much" of only one benefit: vocational training (skills and techniques directly applicable to jobs). Thirty-six percent felt that the students received a great deal of background and specialization for further education in some professional, scientific, or scholarly field. Otherwise, no more than 26 percent felt that their students received "very much" of the specified benefits.

The faculty members were also asked to indicate which of the 17 specified benefits they felt were most important of all to their students (item 40B). There was a wide array of opinion on this matter, but the vast majority of the faculty confined their responses to 4 benefits: personal development (23 percent), vocational training (18 percent), tolerance and understanding of other people and their values (14 percent), and critical thinking (10 percent). None considered broadened literary acquaintance and appreciation; development of friendships and loyalties of lasting value; or vocabulary, terminology, and facts in various fields of knowledge as the most important benefits for their students. Only 1 percent respectively considered aesthetics and sensitivity, understanding and appreciation of science and technology, or citizenship to be the most important benefits for their students.

Clearly the faculty placed greatest emphasis on broad social and personal development and specific vocational training. As noted above,

however, only in respect to one of these benefits did they feel that most of their students greatly benefited. Seventy-eight percent felt that their students should receive "very much" vocational training and 60 percent felt that they actually did receive this training. Seventy-one percent felt that their students should receive personal development in contrast to 23 percent who felt that they actually did receive "very much" of this benefit. Sixty-four percent felt that their students should receive a great deal of critical thinking in contrast to 11 percent who felt that they actually did so. Finally, 66 percent felt that their students should receive the benefit of tolerance and understanding of other people and their values in contrast to the 18 percent who actually felt that they did receive "very much" of this benefit. Moreover, although seldom did more than 2 percent feel that their students should receive "little or none" of the specified benefits, typically at least 15 percent felt that their students actually receive "little or none" of the specified benefits.

In some ways these data provide a comprehensive index of the educational priorities perceived by faculty members in the two-year colleges under study and also serve as an index of the major gaps in related educational accomplishments as perceived by the faculty. The data, however, must be examined in light of the no response rates. Approximately 5 percent of the faculty failed to respond to the benefits that they felt their students were receiving, approximately 13 percent failed to respond to the questions on the benefits that they felt their students should receive, and 25 percent failed to respond to what they thought was the most important benefit for their students to receive.

Factor analysis of the responses to the specified benefits yielded three major factors in terms of both what the students do and should receive, although there was a little variation between benefits loading on the "do receive" and "should receive" factors. The first factor drawn from the benefits students do receive might well be termed "Personal and Social Development"; it included, by order of the benefits' loadings: appreciation of individuality (benefit number 12 of item 40), personal development (6), tolerance and understanding (16), social development (5), development of friendships (13), improved social and economic status (17), appreciation of moral and ethical standards (15), citizenship (11), and--seemingly out of place--critical thinking (7).

The "Academic Development" factor included, in order: broadened literary acquaintance (3), aesthetic sensitivity (8), background for further education (2); awareness of different philosophies and cultures (4), and writing and speaking skills (9).

Three benefits loaded on the "Vocational Development" factor: vocational training applicable to a job (1), terminology and facts in various fields of knowledge (14), and appreciation of science and technology (10).

Benefits 11, 13, 15, and 17 were dropped from the Personal and Social Development factor, and writing and speaking skills (9) added in the factor analysis of the faculty's responses to what should occur. Benefit 9, writing and speaking skills, failed to load on the Academic Development factor. Otherwise, the benefits comprising the three "should occur" factors remained identical to those comprising the "do occur" factors.

The analyses of variance of the standardized factor scores of the faculty revealed statistically significant differences beyond the 1 percent level among the 15 institutions on all but Personal and Social Development and Vocational Development in reference to what students should receive (Table 6-4). Langston and Walden were colleges that were consistently over-represented among the three lowest scoring institutions on the three scales indicating the benefits that students do receive. Lowell, Palmerston, and Appleton were over-represented among the three lowest scoring institutions on the scales indicating benefits the students should receive. Sherwood was the only college that was among the three highest scoring institutions on more than one scale indicating benefits that students do receive; Foster and Manning were the only two colleges among the three highest scoring institutions on more than one scale indicating benefits that students should receive. Palmerston and Lowell were among the three lowest scoring institutions on the Academic Development scale indicating benefits students both do and should receive. Walden was among the three lowest scoring institutions on the Vocational Development scale indicating benefits students do and should receive.

At the other extreme, Sherwood was among the three highest scoring institutions on the two Personal and Social Development scales; the same situation held true for Lowell on the Vocational Development scales. Other than this correspondence, the trend was more toward disparity between the benefits the faculty members felt their students do and should receive.

But even more marked was the disparity between what benefits the faculty members at the different institutions considered most realized by and most important to their students.

Community Benefits

The faculty were also asked about the benefits their colleges' communities were receiving and should ideally receive (item 46). They were presented with ten benefits that the community can receive from junior colleges. They were then asked to indicate the first, second, and third most important benefits that their communities were presently receiving from their colleges and the first, second, and third most important benefits that their communities should ideally receive. Possibly they were less sure about the benefits their colleges had or should have for their communities than for their students since between 18 and 26 percent of them failed to respond to the various alternatives presented them.

Three benefits, however, stood out above all others in terms of benefits the responding faculty felt their communities were presently receiving or should receive ideally. These three were, in order of the proportion of faculty considering them the most important benefits: (1) offering exposure to higher education to students who for financial reasons would not otherwise have had such an opportunity; (2) allowing undecided students an opportunity to explore alternative educational and vocational paths; and (3) training of skilled personnel to fill manpower needs of local industry.

Forty-five percent of the faculty thought that educational exposure was the most important benefit presently being received, 24 percent felt that allowing undecided students an opportunity to explore alternative educational and vocational paths were presently being received, and 20 percent thought that training of skilled personnel to fill manpower needs of local industry was the benefit presently most being received. Between 8 and 15 percent felt that raising the intellectual and cultural level of the community and developing talents and abilities of adults were either the second or the third most important benefits being received. Otherwise for the most part only one percent felt that any of the other benefits were being received whether in first, second, or third place, with two exceptions where 5 percent felt that the specified benefits were the third most important being received by the community. The two exceptions were providing facilities for community use and source of pride and identification

for their colleges' local communities due to their colleges' academic offerings, athletics, and vocational training.

Only a negligible proportion of the faculty, therefore, considered the following benefits as either being received at present by their communities or ideally to be received by their communities. These were developing talents and abilities of adults, upgrading the skills or retraining for adults, and, more particularly, providing facilities for community use; source of pride and identification for their colleges' local communities due to academic activities, athletics, or vocational training; attracting or holding significant business and industry to the community; and assisting in the development of their communities.

The greatest discrepancies between the benefits that the faculty felt were presently being received and should be received ideally included two cases: the 4 percent of the faculty that felt that raising the intellectual and cultural level of their communities was the first most important benefit not being received in contrast to the 12 percent that felt this should be the most important benefit received ideally; and the 45 percent of the faculty that felt that offering exposure to higher education to students who for financial reasons would not otherwise have had such an opportunity was being realized in contrast to the 37 percent who felt this benefit should be the first most important benefit ideally. Only one percent mentioned any other benefits than those specified, and then only as the first most important in terms of benefits presently received or to be received ideally.

The benefits stressed most as those presently received or to be received ideally, then, were vocational training and the offering of higher educational opportunities to those who might not otherwise have them. Community services were stressed little and, once again, educational services for adults were viewed as having relatively little importance.

Student Characteristics

The faculty were asked to compare their students with college students in general on 15 characteristics having to do with academic prowess, social skills and adjustment, motivation and awareness of and interest in society (item 39). The majority considered the students at their own institution to be average in reference to most of the characteristics compared with college students in general. There were exceptions, however. Between 52

percent and 65 percent of the faculty considered their own students below average compared to college students generally in academic background, study habits, and self-confidence regarding academic matters. Approximately 33 percent or more also considered their students below average in leadership ability, social skills, drive to succeed, political interest, and interest in school.

At the other end of the continuum 17 percent felt that their students were above average in their drive to succeed. Between 11 and 13 percent considered their students above average in political interest, maturity, interest in school, awareness of political and social events, and leadership ability. Between 1 and 8 percent saw their students above average on any of the other characteristics.

There was relatively wide variation in the faculty's rating of their students' drive to succeed, political interests, and interest in school. These overall responses may be in part a reflection of their awareness of the wide heterogeneity of characteristics of their students in these community colleges. They may also reflect some lack of awareness on the part of the faculty members themselves. This is suggested inasmuch as the vast body of research on junior college student characteristics indicates that junior college students are below average on most of these characteristics compared to college students generally, when including four-year college and university students.

Perhaps more to the point, however, is that a majority do see their students below average on several critical academic characteristics and a large segment see their students below average in several social and motivational areas. These perceptions on the part of the faculty depart radically from the students' perceptions of themselves as indicated in the data on the survey of the students. Attention might well be given to the reconciliation of these discrepant perceptions, particularly in light of the high attrition rate of two-year college students, the discrepancy between those who plan to enter four-year colleges versus those who actually do so, and the difficulties experienced by those students who actually do transfer.

Factor analysis of the faculty's responses regarding their students' characteristics revealed four distinct factors having to do with different areas of the students' characteristics as perceived by the faculty. The first, "Academic Potential", included in order of their loading on the

factor: academic background (characteristic 1 of item 39), academic self-confidence (11); study habits (7), and intelligence (4).

The second factor, "Maturity and Drive" does not appear to be unidimensional, but rather contains elements of general and emotional maturity as well as ambition. This factor includes interest in school (14), maturity (13), drive to succeed (6), interest in social activities (9), and emotional adjustment (10).

"Political Orientation", the third factor, includes political interest (8), awareness of political and social events (15), and interest in social activities (9).

"Sociability", the fourth and final factor, includes social self-confidence (12), social skills (5), and emotional adjustment (10). The characteristics of "Emotional Adjustment" and "interest in social activities" load on two factors, thereby probably reducing the independence of these factors to a small degree.

With the exception of the Sociability scale analysis of variance of the standard scores derived from the faculty's responses to these scales revealed institutional differences well beyond the one percent level of significance (Table 6-5). As has been the case throughout these data, there were systematic differences among the 15 institutions. Palmerston was the lowest scoring institution on all four of the scales. Walden was among the three lowest scoring institutions on three of the scales, and Quanto on two of them. Not shown in Table 6-5 is Langston which was .01 off from being among the three lowest scoring institutions on the Academic Potential and Sociability scales. There was less consistency among the three highest scoring institutions, although Manning was among these institutions on three of the scales. Sherwood, one of the highest scoring institutions on Maturity and Drive, followed Meade by .02 points (not shown in Table 6-5) on Sociability. Manning, whose students and faculty consistently exhibited very positive attitudes on the survey items, scored next to lowest on the Academic Potential scale. Throughout these data the institutional differences and the implications of these differences have been such as to make highly desirable further investigation and discussion of the differences which were not possible within the confines of the present study.

Student Personnel Services

The literature on community colleges gives great attention to student personnel services in these colleges. They are recognized as a major means for reaching and meeting the different needs of the colleges' diverse students, thereby opening every avenue possible directed towards assisting students to make the most use of their educational opportunities. No attempt could be made to evaluate student personnel services in The Study of Junior Colleges, however, other than through the ratings given these services from the perspectives of the students and the faculty.

The faculty members, like the students, were asked to indicate whether they thought nine specified categories of services were either "strong", "average", or "weak." The modal tendency was for the faculty members to consider each of the categories of services as average (item 48). The largest proportion fell in the "average" column for each specified area of service, the distributions of percentages being from 44 to 58.

However, there was no consensus of opinions. Approximately 30 percent or more of the faculty, for example, considered their colleges' admissions and registration, records and information, financial aids, and special counseling for disadvantaged students to be strong services. On the other hand, approximately 30 percent or more considered academic guidance and counseling, vocational guidance and counseling, placement for work, student activities, and special counseling for students with academic problems to be weak services in their colleges.

With the exception of special counseling for disadvantaged students, the services rated strongest by the faculty were those having to do primarily with business detail (that is, admissions and registration, records and information, and financial aids). Even in respect to special counseling for disadvantaged students 23 percent of the faculty rated the services "weak." Otherwise those services rated weakest had to do with counseling and guidance and the interaction with students through activities, those services most relevant to students' education and vocational development.

Administrative Responsibilities

The faculty members were presented with 11 specified administrative or policy functions of the junior college and were presented with four responsible groups: the faculty, the administration, the trustees or governing board, and the students (item 43). They were asked, "Which group do you think should

have the primary and which the secondary responsibility for the specified activities?" For each activity and for each group they were to indicate whether the group should have the primary responsibility, some responsibility, or no responsibility.

With the exception of the students, by and large the faculty felt that all of the remaining three groups should have at least some responsibility for the indicated activities. Differential patterns of responses existed, however, when it came to a consensus of responses; that is, when it came to those specific categories to which a majority of the faculty responded. An "X" in Table 6-6 indicates each case where a majority responded that a particular group should have primary, secondary, or no responsibility for each specified activity.

A majority of the faculty felt that they should have the primary responsibility for degree requirements, evaluation of the faculty, teaching assignments, and the selection of department chairmen. A majority also felt that they should have at least some responsibility for student admissions; student conduct; and salaries, budget, and resource allocations. But they were more divided in their opinions about who should have the primary or secondary responsibility for recruitment of faculty, selection of administrators other than the president, the selection of the president, and the evaluation of the administration.

The majority felt that the administration should have the primary responsibility for student admissions; selection of faculty; selection of administrators other than the president; for evaluation of faculty; for student conduct; and for salaries, budget, and resource allocations. A majority also felt that the administration should have some responsibility for the selection of the president.

A majority felt that the trustees or governing board should have the primary responsibility for only two activities: the selection of the president and salaries, budget, and resource allocations.

Students were given relatively short shrift, although many faculty members felt that the students should have some responsibility for the different activities. A majority felt that students should have no responsibility for student admissions; faculty hiring; selection of administrators; selection of the president; salaries, budget, and resource allocations; teaching assignments; and the selection of departmental chairmen.

A majority felt that students should have primary responsibility for only one activity, student conduct, and a majority felt that students should have some responsibility for only one other activity, degree requirements.

As may be noted in the above discussion, a majority of the faculty felt that both the faculty and the administration should have the primary responsibility for evaluation of faculty. Also, a majority felt that the administration and the trustees or governing board should have the primary responsibility for salaries, budget, and resource allocations. This may indicate inconsistency on the faculty's part, but it is just as likely or even more likely that they felt that both groups should share the primary responsibility for the respective two activities.

The students were not shunned by the faculty altogether. For example, although a majority felt that the faculty and administration should have the primary responsibility for faculty evaluation, only 15 percent said that students should have no responsibility for this matter, compared to 38 percent who felt that students should have the primary responsibility for faculty evaluation, and 47 percent of the faculty that felt that students should have some responsibility for this activity. Indeed the responses for the faculty on the whole seem to reflect a desire to have a participatory rather than unilateral mode for policy formation and implementation.

Control of Students

The faculty members were largely moderate to permissive in their responses to the question, "In your opinion to what extent should your junior college exert control over the following student behaviors?" Generally between 7 and 17 percent felt that the junior college should exert considerable control over the eight specified areas of student behavior (item 41). In two cases, however, 30 percent felt that the junior college should exert considerable control. These cases had to do with speech (that is, profanity) and campus student protest. Half of the faculty felt that the junior college should exert moderate control over student publication of newspapers, student speaker programs, elections, and on-campus political organizations. A simple majority felt that the junior college should exert little control over dress and grooming standards, expressive art and music and student housing arrangements. In reference to all eight specified student behaviors a considerable majority felt

that the junior college should exert moderate or little control rather than considerable control.

In only those two cases having to do with speech and campus student protest was there a larger proportion that felt the junior college should exert considerable control rather than little control. Thus, the apparent predominant philosophy of the faculty was that the students should have a paramount role in the conduct of their own affairs, but not entirely exclusive of the school as a whole.

Factor analysis of the faculty's responses to the eight areas yielded only one factor: "Exertion of Control." Analysis of variance of the standard scores derived thereby revealed statistically significant differences among the 15 institutions, but not markedly so ($F = 3.47$; $P < .01$). The institutional standard means ranged from $-.56$ to $.38$. The three lowest scoring institutions were Kinsey, Sherwood, and Langston. The three highest scoring institutions (advocating more control) were Lowell, Shaw, and Newson.

Faculty Satisfaction

The faculty members were asked to respond if they were "satisfied", "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied", or "dissatisfied" with 18 specified areas having to do with the functioning of their college (item 35). For the most part the majority expressed satisfaction with the issues phrased by the individual items. However, in each case there was a significant proportion that expressed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction, or that expressed outright dissatisfaction; between 5 and 34 percent expressed dissatisfaction depending upon the particular issue. In most cases at least 15 percent expressed dissatisfaction--certainly a minority, but an apparently significant minority considering that the dissatisfaction cut across so many elements.

No doubt the precise source, symptoms, and solutions for the dissatisfaction warrant much further investigation, but the issue of dissatisfaction must be examined in light of the generally positive attitudes of the faculty. There were five items to which a particularly large proportion responded with satisfaction. These were job security (76 percent), relationships with academic faculty (70 percent), assignments outside of the classroom (69 percent), library facilities (69 percent), and relationships with vocational faculty (66 percent).

There were three items regarding which only a minority of the faculty expressed satisfaction: policies of state governing agencies (21 percent), quality of students (32 percent), and policies of the board of trustees (43 percent). The proportion of faculty actually expressing dissatisfaction with these areas were respectively 34, 25, and 21 percent. Issues regarding which at least 15 percent of the faculty expressed dissatisfaction were policies related to promotion and tenure, salary schedules, work loads, policies of the board of trustees, policies of state governing agencies, opportunities for attending professional meetings, relationships with administrators, class size, quality of students, attitudes of students, and facilities.

The faculty consistently in larger proportion expressed satisfaction with the various functional areas of their colleges than they felt was the case for their colleagues. In respect to each of the 18 areas of inquiry a larger proportion reported that they were satisfied, than they reported their colleagues being satisfied. In respect to only 6 of the 18 areas did a majority think that their colleagues were satisfied. In a majority of cases, at least 20 percent felt that their colleagues were actually dissatisfied. The areas regarding which they thought their colleagues had the greatest dissatisfaction were salary schedule, policies of the board of trustees, relationships with administrators, class size, the quality of students, and, as was the case for themselves, particularly policies of state governing agencies.

There were five areas where there was an exceptionally large discrepancy between the proportion of faculty expressing satisfaction from their own point of view versus their perceptions of their colleagues. The discrepancy between proportions of faculty themselves and their colleagues being satisfied was roughly 20 percent or more for each area. The areas included salary schedule, workload, relationships with administrators, class size, and attitudes of students. In each case an observably larger proportion of faculty expressed that they were satisfied, than was their perception of their colleagues.

One interpretation of the discrepancy between the faculty members' self-reported personal feelings and their perceptions of the feelings of their colleagues is that conversations among faculty members no doubt frequently include gripe sessions leading an individual faculty member

to think that his colleagues are unhappier than he himself; whereas, all the faculty members may relieve similar dissatisfactions just by talking them out. In any event, the indications remain that those areas regarding which large proportions expressed their own dissatisfaction or perceived their colleagues to be dissatisfied surely deserve attention.

A final note in this context is that apparently a larger proportion of the faculty were unsure about their colleagues' feelings than they were about their own, since roughly 15 percent did not respond to the items regarding their colleagues' feelings in contrast to roughly 4 percent that did not respond to the questions about their own feelings.

College Preference for Employment

Whatever the faculty members' satisfactions or dissatisfactions, the majority of them still would most prefer employment in the same kind of institution in which most of them were teaching, a public junior college. More specifically, when asked at what type of educational institution they would most prefer employment, 62 percent replied they preferred employment in a public junior college and 2 percent at a private junior college. Of course, this still left a considerable proportion that expressed that they would prefer to teach at another type of institution. Thirty percent reported that they would prefer to teach in a four-year college or university. Only 4 percent reported that they would prefer employment outside of a school or college.

College Preference for Own Children

One measure of the faculty members' attitudes towards junior colleges was deemed to be whether or not they would prefer that their own children attend a junior college versus some other type of college. Therefore, the faculty members were asked "What type of college would you prefer your children to attend for their first two years if admission and finances were no consideration?" Eight types of two-year and four-year colleges were listed and the faculty members were asked to indicate their first, second, and third choices of these colleges. Thirty-one percent indicated a public junior college as their first choice for their children during their first two years of college and 4 percent a private junior college. But the remaining 65 percent preferred a public or private four-year college or university. Thirteen percent listed a public junior college as

their second choice, and 11 percent a public junior college as their third choice.

In averaging the percentages across the three choices, 18 percent of the junior college faculty members indicated a preference that their children attend a public junior college during their first two years, and 5 percent a private junior college, leaving, on the average, 77 percent who preferred a public or private four-year college or university for their children. In averaging the percentages across the three choices, 16 percent preferred, respectively, a public four-year college, private four-year college, public university, and a private university.

The data on the faculty's evaluation and perceptions of their colleges are numerous and complex; only selected findings will be summarized here. They considered their colleges as relatively high in Practicality and Community, the latter in spite of the fact that they reported little out-of-class interaction with their students, and that it was difficult for students to get together for recreational purposes. They considered their colleges relatively low in intellectual climate, or Awareness, and in Propriety. Their opinions were mixed on the scholarliness of their colleges' environments.

They considered the most important student outcomes to be personal and social development, vocational development, tolerance for others, and the ability to think critically. With the exception of vocational training, however, very few felt that these outcomes were realized to any great extent.

The main benefits the faculty felt their communities received from their colleges were opportunities for higher education and vocational training for those who might not otherwise have these opportunities. They placed little emphasis on continuing, adult education or retraining of adults specifically, services that might be increasingly important during a time when manpower needs are changing radically.

They considered their students "average" on various academic and personal characteristics and skills with the exception of study skills. They considered them "below average" in academic background, academic self-confidence and study habits, in contrast to the students' self-perceptions.

They tended to rate their colleges' student personnel services as "average," although many of the faculty rated their colleges' academic and

vocational counseling, job placement services, and special counseling for academic problems as "weak."

They tended to favor participatory administrative procedures although they varied in their views as to which constituent college groups should have primary administrative responsibility depending upon the activity involved. Students tended to be left out of the administrative and policy-making process, with the exception of jurisdiction over their own conduct. The faculty also considered that the college should exert moderate to little control over student conduct.

They generally expressed satisfaction with major functional areas of their colleges with the exception of the policies of their state governing boards and their trustees and the qualities of their students. They felt their colleagues to be less satisfied than they reported themselves to be.

A majority reported preferring to teach at a public junior college, but a majority would prefer to have their children spend their first two years of college at a four-year college or university.

Factor analyses were made of the responses to the many sub-items that went into the variables concerning college environments, student benefits, student characteristics, and the colleges' control over students. A variety of scales were developed from these analyses, almost all of which discriminated among the 15 institutions surveyed with a high degree of significance, indicating a great deal of diversity among the colleges on these factors.

Educational Priorities

As a final indication of the faculty members' perceptions of their own college and junior colleges generally, they were asked their opinions about the accomplishments and preferred future directions of their colleges, and their opinions about the future prospects for the whole junior college system.

Priorities of the Faculty's Colleges

The faculty members were asked to indicate what they considered the two most important educational priorities at their colleges and the two least important priorities for both the present and the future (item 44).

In each case there were two listings for the most important priorities and two listings for the least important priorities.

There were indications of both a certain amount of consensus and diversity of opinion among the faculty. But quite clearly what they considered most important, as a group, was general education for transfer to a four-year institution and either special occupational programs for local business and industry, or occupational programs leading to a certificate or associate degree. In the first listing of the most important priorities for the present, 60 percent indicated that general education for transfer to a four-year institution was most important.

The distribution of faculty indicating other priorities among the remaining six specified was fairly even across the listed priorities, the highest proportion being the 12 percent that indicated that remedial and high potential programs for disadvantaged students were most important and the 12 percent that indicated special occupational programs for local business and industry were most important.

In the second listing of most important priorities, 33 percent indicated special occupational programs as most important; 43 percent indicated occupational programs leading to a certificate or associate degree as most important; and 25 percent indicated that remedial or high potential programs for disadvantaged students were most important.

The same pattern of responses precisely existed when the faculty members considered the most important priorities for the future. The programs that the largest proportion felt were least important both in the present and future, were preparation in a specific subject field for transfer to a four-year institution, non-college credit adult education, and special occupational programs for local business and industry. Between 25 and 35 percent in one distribution or the other considered these programs as least important. The same pattern held true for the future, with the addition of 22 percent on one listing, indicating general education for transfer to a four-year institution, as well, as least important.

In general, then, they endorsed as most important general education for transfer to a four-year institution and vocational education, either in terms of special occupation programs for local business or occupational programs leading to a certificate or degree. Consistently the three programs

least endorsed as the most important priorities were preparation in a specific subject field for transfer (not to be confused with general education for transfer), continuing education for college credit, and adult education for non-college credit.

Diversity of faculty opinion about educational priorities is particularly apparent inasmuch as a significant proportion saw both education for transfer to a four-year institution and vocational educational programs as least important even though these were considered by the faculty at large as the most important priorities. Apparent also is the fact that a number of faculty were either unwilling or unable to indicate what they felt were the most important priorities, since between 12 and 35 percent did not respond to one or the other priorities listed. Moreover, a number of faculty members apparently checked only one most important and one least important priority.

Remedial and high potential programs for disadvantaged students were not endorsed much more than continuing adult education programs. At most 25 percent of the faculty considered remedial programs as most important for the present and 30 percent for the future. On the other hand, depending upon the listing, 18 percent considered remedial programs least important for the present and 15 percent for the future. On the average only one percent suggested any other educational priority than those enumerated in the questionnaire. In sum, then, the faculty endorsed what have been the traditional transfer, vocational/technical programs in the junior college and relatively few saw any other educational priorities.

Future Prospects for the Junior College System

In conclusion, the faculty members were presented with seven future prospects for the junior college system and were asked to indicate which of these prospects they expected to occur and which they would like to see occur. There was very close correspondence between the proportion of faculty that expected a phenomenon to occur and the proportion that would like to see it occur.

The prospects follow in the order of the proportion of faculty that reported expecting them to occur: (1) expansion of occupational education programs, (2) expansion of continuing education, (3) the continuation of the operation of junior colleges essentially as they are, (4) the assumption of all lower division responsibilities from present

four-year institutions, (5-6) the movement of occupational programs to technical institutions tied in fifth place with the movement of secondary level occupational programs to area vocational schools, and (7) the conversion of most two-year colleges to four-year colleges.

A majority (58 percent) expected only one prospect to occur, the expansion of occupational education programs. At the opposite end of the distribution only 8 percent expected conversion of most two-year colleges to four-year colleges.

As indicated above, the ranking of the proportions of faculty that would actually like to see the various prospects occur closely followed their expectations, with only one exception: the third highest proportion reported they expected the continuation of the operation of junior colleges essentially as they are in contrast to the fact that the next to the lowest proportion would like to see this occur. Forty-two percent of the faculty reported expecting the continuation of the operation of junior colleges essentially as they are, but only 20 percent would like to see this occur. Another way of interpreting this finding, of course, is that the vast majority would like to see some change in the functioning of junior colleges in the future. Important to find out through future research is the precise nature of the changes that the faculty members would like to see, and why.

In the meantime, a majority of the faculty advocated the expansion of occupational education programs (59 percent) and the expansion of continuing education (57 percent). As indicated in the above discussion, the faculty members placed the highest priority on general education for transfer to a four-year institution and occupational programs, either those for local business and industry or those leading to a certificate or associate degree at their own colleges. Therefore, it is understandable that a majority would like to see the expansion of occupational education programs.

However, the faculty members placed relatively low priority on continuing education for college credit or adult education for non-college credit at their colleges. This finding does not appear altogether compatible with the fact that a majority would like to see the expansion of continuing education in the future. This apparent discrepancy may be accounted for by the fact that in the earlier item the faculty members were asked to indicate what they felt were the two most important and the two least

important educational priorities assuming limited resources, whereas in the second item they were asked what they would like to see occur regardless of resources. The faculty may simply be realistic about what can be done with limited supporting resources.

In addition to the continuation of junior colleges the way they are there was some discrepancy between the faculty's expectations and what they would like to see occur in reference to two other categories. Fourteen percent reported that they expected occupational programs to be moved to technical institutions, and 22 percent would like to see this phenomenon occur. Again, 14 percent expected there to be movement of the secondary level occupational programs to area vocational schools, and 23 percent would like to see this occur. Only 2 percent offered any other expectation than those listed in the questionnaire, and only 3 percent indicated they would like to see any other prospects.

Apparently, then, most of the faculty would essentially like to see their colleges and the junior college system as a whole continue doing or expanding what now appear to be their primary functions.

CHAPTER 7

COUNSELOR PROFILES

The chapter on the student survey added to the evidence that community colleges are more than ever enrolling students who are extremely heterogeneous in terms of their background characteristics, attitudes, values, interests, needs, and aspirations. Thus, if the colleges are to have an impact on these students, their administrators, their faculty, and certainly their counselors, they must be aware of these divergent needs and interests and, even more important, must be responsive to these needs.

The student survey demonstrated that a great number of students in the 15 institutions surveyed expressed the need for help from counselors. There was, however, a great disparity between those who expressed this need and those who actually sought it. But the majority of students who did talk to their counselors felt that they were helpful. No doubt many more students would benefit from counseling if they more actively sought it and no doubt more students would profit if the counselors themselves had more time to reach out to students who could benefit from their assistance.

In order to determine more definitely the counselors' perceptions of their roles, responsibilities, and student clientele, questionnaires were sent to the entire counseling staff at each of the 15 institutions sampled. The questions bore on four broad areas of concern: (1) counseling procedures, (2) interactions with students, (3) perceptions of student problems, and (4) evaluation. The counselors' responses to each question are contained in Appendix E of the separately bound Technical Appendixes.

Although the response rate from this group was high (77 percent), the total number of respondents was only 99. As a result, analyses of the counselors' responses to the questionnaire items were made only of the total group, the small number rendering statistical comparisons among institutions problematic. In addition, since many of the items in the counselor questionnaire were open-ended, the response categories, although subjected to content analyses, were too numerous to lend themselves to statistical comparisons by institution. This situation is, in one sense, unfortunate, as it was apparent from interviews conducted with the Deans of Student Personnel that the policies of and basic attitudes toward

counseling varied considerably from school to school. However, additional research efforts based on larger samples of schools should yield sufficient data for reliable institutional comparisons.

Counseling Procedures

A critical variable in determining the amount of time counselors are actually able to devote to individual student counseling rests on the amount and kind of activities in which they must engage and the responsibilities for which they are held accountable by the school administration. Assuming that the counselors surveyed worked at least approximately 40 hours per week, their time apparently was devoted to a variety of activities other than counseling. Forty-one percent of the counselors reported spending 20 hours or less a week in counseling activities. Meetings required over 3 hours a week for 47 percent of the counselors, and other activities absorbed over 5 hours for 44 percent of the respondents.

Research evidently was not one of the primary duties of counselors in most of the institutions; 59 percent were not involved at all in this activity, and only 10 percent spent more than 3 hours per week devoted to it. Of those few who were involved in research, 24 percent reported that it was related to the testing of students; 30 percent said that their research pertained to the study of student characteristics and counseling techniques; and 47 percent described research activities related to special programs or other interests.

Fifteen percent of the counselors reported that they participated a great deal in the development of curricula and courses. An additional 52 percent said that they sometimes participated in such developmental procedures. The extent to which counselors participate in the development of curricula and courses reflects, to a degree, the attitude of the administration toward the counselor role. Although some of the colleges' administrators perceived their counselors as basically academic or vocational advisors, and some as personal therapists, others viewed them as more of an integral part of the institutions' staff.

When asked to what extent they were free to plan their own schedules, 57 percent of the counselors replied that they had a great deal of liberty in this regard, and 33 percent reported "some freedom." Only 10 percent

said that they had "very little freedom" to structure their own professional time.

Counseling sessions lasting from 15 to 30 minutes were reported by 61 percent of the counselors; 33 percent reported sessions lasting from 30 to 60 minutes. Six percent reported sessions of less than 15 minutes. (The largest proportion of the students perceived their counseling sessions to be confined to 15 minutes.) The large majority (91 percent) of the counselors were satisfied with the usual duration of their appointments with students, as described. The project's staff, however, questions how well students' needs can be met when, on the average, they have only one counseling session each term of 15 to 30 minutes duration.

The counselors apparently apportioned the time that they spent with their students according to the nature of students' problems as students saw them, or perhaps as they were encouraged to see them. That is, as previously stated, a large proportion of students (39 percent) reported they needed help with educational plans; and, according to the data, the counselors surveyed devoted considerably more time to program planning than to any other type of counseling activity.

In addition to spending time on program planning, as seen from Table 7-1 (Appendix E), the counselors also spent time, in order, on students' personal problems, vocational guidance, and academic problems. The distribution of percentages in this item seems to substantiate the fact that the majority of the counselors' time was devoted to working with students mainly in program planning. Under the circumstance, it seems likely that the majority of counseling sessions would last less than 30 minutes and would be considered sufficiently long to the large majority of counselors.

Whatever the students' problems, the counselors were not without some relatively objective information about their students, even though information is not available regarding the use the counselor made of this information. Most of the counselors (97 percent) indicated that college grade records were readily available to them, and 88 percent reported the ready accessibility of high school records as well. Aptitude and achievement test scores were reported available to 67 percent of the counselors; disciplinary records available to 13 percent; and extra-curricular activities, work records, and personal comments from teachers were available to

slightly less than 10 percent of the counselors.

The large majority of counselors (87 percent) also reported that they were allowed to maintain complete confidentiality with students and the information they had about them. The remainder indicated that they were allowed only some confidentiality. Regardless of confidentiality, the large majority of the counselors maintained files at least some of the time, although most of these were in the form of informal notes. Ten percent of the counselors reported that they kept no files on their students. Quite possibly, in institutions where counselors are viewed only or mainly as program advisors, there would be less importance placed on the necessity for complete confidentiality which is taken for granted when counselors deal with more personal problems.

Interaction With Students

The counselors perceived themselves to be easily accessible to their students. Eighty-three percent reported that in addition to scheduled appointments, a counselor was available for walk-in sessions. Fifty-five percent said that students could walk in with no appointment necessary, and 39 percent reported that appointments were generally scheduled a few days after requested. Only 2 percent said that students had a long waiting period for an appointment.

A large majority of the counselors (87 percent) reported that they frequently saw students who made voluntary appointments, and 75 percent of them reported frequently seeing those who walked in their offices for informal counseling without appointments. Twenty-nine percent of the counselors reported frequently seeing students who registered for compulsory appointments, and 16 percent reported frequently seeing those who were contacted by the counselors for an appointment. Sixty-three percent reported seeking out students who made appointments but did not show up for them; 60 percent expressed that they made themselves available to students outside of their offices, and 81 percent reported other means of student contact.

Additional reports indicate that the means the counselor found for interacting with the students were diverse. Approximately 90 percent of the counselors reported that they reached students either through printed

matter in the college, from group counseling referrals, or from monitoring student records. Seventy percent reported that faculty referrals represented a source of student contacts.

Seventy-one percent of the counselors believed that their counseling programs were reaching the students who needed them. Of those who did not, approximately 24 percent cited the fact that students did not seek help, were opposed to or ignorant of the counseling services available to them. Only 5 percent related this problem to their own lack of outreach opportunities, and 16 percent to their own limited time for dealing with student problems.

There are apparently some differences in the perceptions of the colleges' personnel about the counselors' "outreach." Some of the Deans of Student Personnel reported that they encouraged counselors to circulate among students on campus gathering spots in an attempt to break up the traditional image of the counselors sitting back waiting for students to come to them, but that the counselors had thus far been reluctant to venture into this outreach role.

Counselors' Perceptions of Students' Problems

The counselors' perceptions of the types of problems students had were not always consistent with the students' perceptions of their problems. For example, when asked about the types of problems they faced, few students (9 percent) reported uncertainty of the future whereas 57 percent of the counselors reported that this was a major problem for their students. Thirty-one percent of the students reported poor study habits as a major concern; only 8 percent of the counselors cited this as a major student problem. In apparent contradiction, however, 41 percent of the counselors reported that educational and academic disadvantages were major student problems whereas the student questionnaire elicited no such concern on the part of any sizeable number of students.

Thirty-four percent of the counselors believed that unrealistic aspirations formed a major student problem, a consideration which appears warranted in view of the responses students gave to questions regarding their future educational and occupational plans. (Chapter 5 includes some comments on this lack of realism which were prompted by juxtaposing

students' financial and educational difficulties with inordinately ambitious career aspirations.) However, 39 percent of the students did report needing help with their educational plans.

Although 34 percent of the counselors considered personal problems as a major student concern, only 21 percent of the students cited this as applicable to them. Indeed, only 11 percent reported having discussed their personal problems with a counselor. The proportions of students and counselors who saw a lack of vocational and academic information as a major student problem were somewhat closer (30 and 37 percent respectively). The same was true of the proportions of students and counselors who viewed financial concerns as a problem (students, 28 percent and counselors, 20 percent).

The discrepancy between student and counselor reports of students' problems may reflect the students' inability to define their problems, or possibly their unwillingness to report them. It may also reflect the counselors' lack of opportunity to make these students aware of their problems. A further possibility for this discrepancy may relate to the response bias of the student sample. As indicated in another section of this report, the non-respondents tended to represent a slightly less advantaged group than did the respondents, and the counselors might have been responding in regards to a wider array of student problems than was reported by the students themselves.

Counselors' Evaluation

Over half of the counselors reported that they got no feedback from the administration (56 percent) or students (52 percent) with respect to how well they were performing their counseling functions. Sixty-two percent reported no feedback from the faculty in this regard. This is particularly unfortunate since often the results of the counselors' impact on students cannot be determined in the immediate future, but rather in terms of long-range changes in students' attitudes and behaviors. At the same time, without some feedback from administrators, faculty, and students--either in the form of critical suggestions and comments or positive encouragement and reinforcements--counselors cannot adequately evaluate their effectiveness.

Without such feedback it would also appear to be difficult for the counselors to participate in policy decisions regarding the school's counseling program. Yet, lack of feedback did not seem to affect the counselors' participation in such policy decisions. In fact, 62 percent of the counselors felt that they had a considerable amount of influence on school policies regarding their counseling programs. Thirty-seven percent felt that they had some, but a limited amount of input in this regard; 2 percent reported that they had no input.

Moreover, in general the counselors did not appear really dissatisfied with their present positions, even though a majority of them would have liked to have seen some change in their activities. Thirty-two percent of the counselors reported that they preferred their current mode of professional activity, but another third indicated a preference for more personal, vocational, and academic counseling. Thirteen percent would have preferred more time devoted to student outreach; 10 percent would have liked to devote their time to teaching, and 8 percent to professional growth activities.

Although most counselors seemed basically satisfied with their jobs, as well as with their schools' programs, many had suggestions for improvements; among the more common of which were related to student needs for more personal, vocational, and academic counseling (item 20). These included more time for personal counseling (57 percent), more group counseling (53 percent), and more time to deal with students with academic problems (40 percent). In addition, 24 percent suggested more time was needed for vocational testing, and 20 percent felt a need for more information about student performance.

The counselors were also asked in item 21, "If you could make only one suggestion to improve the student personnel program, what would it be?" Seventy-five percent of the responses centered on seven apparently pertinent issues:

1. lowering the work load (16 percent)
2. increasing outreach activities (12 percent)
3. improving the quality of counseling (11 percent)
4. changing the leadership (10 percent)
5. clarifying the role of the counselor (10 percent)

6. improving staff communication (9 percent)

7. placing more stress on counseling (9 percent)

Twenty-five percent of the respondents listed a variety of other suggestions.

In a related question (item 23), the counselors were asked how counseling sessions, specifically, could be improved. Five suggestions predominated. Between 22 and 26 percent listed the need to improve the quality of the counselors, to have more time with students, and to improve the physical environment. More flexibility of scheduling was mentioned by 10 percent of the sample, and more access to student information by 4 percent. Thirty-one percent made a variety of other suggestions.

All of the suggestions appear relevant and in need of further consideration, especially those that were consistently volunteered across the three related questions. Paramount suggestions concerned having more time for students, particularly for personal and academic counseling; better counseling and/or counselors; and greater efforts to reach students. Again, as the community college enrolls increasingly diverse student bodies, with a wide array of problems, the outreach function especially appears to warrant serious consideration as a means of encouraging students to utilize counselors in the role for which many of them were trained.

Proper counseling may help students enormously not only with their academic problems but with their vocational and personal problems as well. In turn, if students' problems are eased, perhaps fewer of them will withdraw from college and more will realize their potential. It is vital that counselors make concerted efforts to reach out for students and also that they encourage students to reach out to them.

CHAPTER 8

STAFF AND STUDENTS: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES*

The community college movement has been of relatively short duration in the totality of educational history. Even within that period of time, however, it has undergone several rather distinct historical stages, each stage providing different emphases and being faced with, and arising as a result of, elements in both society in general and the educational sphere in particular.

Often references are made--at least in academic circles--to the current decade as "the age of the community college." Surely a new stage in the growth of the community college is upon us, appearing to be quite different from the last, and thus demanding a close inspection of purposes, goals, needs, anticipated problems and successes, and desired responses from various sectors of such institutions, a point stressed throughout this report.

Many of the present conditions and future directions in education are enhanced or dissipated by administrators. But faculty, other professional staff members, and students are all becoming more participatory in the affairs of educational institutions and thus are enlarging their potential impact on policy and implementation of decisions and actions. Community colleges offer no exception to this state of affairs, as witnessed by the participatory stance the faculty surveyed took toward their institutions' administrative and governing responsibilities (see Chapter 6). It is therefore appropriate to look at responses elicited from the various segments included in this study (students, faculty, counselors, and administrators) and at how the topics each group considered relate to one another. In this way one can achieve a more complete picture of the present and future needs and trends in community colleges.

If only one of these sample populations were examined in an attempt to discover conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail;

*This chapter was contributed by Glenn F. Nyre of the research staff of the Higher Education Evaluation Program of UCLA's Center for the Study of Evaluation.

beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing in community colleges, the answers gained would be of limited validity. In view of this fact, the data obtained from the various segments of the study were examined in relationship to one another for this portion of the report to the extent possible. In some instances the findings and analyses include only a minimum of concurrent reports of degrees of consensus and disagreement on certain items and variables, while in other instances more exacting cross-analyses were possible.

A limitation of the discussion presented is its unavoidable comparison of responses which were, in some instances, gained from one group by means of a structured-response questionnaire, and from another by an open-ended interview schedule. Caution was exercised to minimize undue comparisons and conclusions in such instances, and those analyses are presented by means of a summary of the responses from each group concerned, followed by a discussion of implications suggested and questions raised. The tables referred to in this chapter are contained in Appendix F of Volume IIA: Technical Appendixes.

Prospects, Problems, and Priorities

Future prospects and anticipated problems are interrelated in such a way that one can discuss them jointly as they relate to differentially elicited comments from faculty, presidents, vocational deans, and instructional deans. Within the general response categories from the interview schedules used for the latter three groups, comparable topics can be found among them and also between them and questions included in the structured-response questionnaire given to the faculty.

As indicated in Chapter 6, the faculty's expectations of what they expect will occur and what they would like to see occur in community colleges nationally are very much in congruence. In both instances the largest percentages indicated an expansion of continuing education and occupational education programs (47 and 57 percent respectively), and the smallest percentages anticipated or desired the conversion of two-year colleges to four-year colleges (8 and 9 percent). The only large disparity

between the two response categories was that, while about 20 percent of the faculty respondents expressed that they would like to see two-year colleges remain "essentially as they are", over 40 percent expected that such will be the case.

When faculty members were asked to identify the two most important and two least important educational priorities of their particular colleges, presently and for the future, they again demonstrated a marked agreement between their choices at both segments of time. As can be seen in summary Table 8-1, Appendix F, the two highest percentages in each category centered on the same priorities, and even more interestingly, by much the same percentages.

As was mentioned in Chapter 6, the faculty members indicated that the expansion of continuing education is one of their two most anticipated future prospects for the community college nationally, and indicated, in even greater proportion, that they would like to see junior colleges move in that direction. Yet they assigned both categories concerning that area the second lowest priorities for both the present and future of their own colleges. The suggestion was made earlier that this apparent disparity of responses may have been because when the faculty were asked to indicate their priorities in the latter case they were given the constraint of limited resources.

In any event, no instructional dean foresaw continuing education as a problem needing attention, and only one of them would have allocated additional funds at his disposal for that purpose. The greatest support vocational/technical programs received from this group of administrators was from one dean who rated it third in his list of problems to be dealt with, though this area received the greatest number of administrator responses (6) concerning additional funding allocation. At the same time, none of the instructional deans stated that they would cut back funding of continuing education if their funds were decreased, whereas the largest number of them (5) stated that they would cut back on vocational/technical program funding.

Of the vocational deans, only one mentioned continuing education as an anticipated problem, ranking it second. Two others designated vocational/technical education as the second most important problem concerning

them. Two of these deans would allocate additional funding to continuing education, and the largest number (5) would increase funding for vocational/technical programs if additional resources were made available to them. One vocational dean would cut back continuing education funding and three would reduce vocational/technical programs if their funds were decreased.

No financial officers mentioned continuing education or vocational/technical programs in response to questions concerning increased or decreased funding, and only three presidents mentioned future problems and anticipated changes that they would include in either of these categories.

On the other hand, when discussing the main purposes of community college education, successful implementation of programs toward achieving goals, and areas in which they would like to achieve further improvements, the presidents gave evidence of their concern and support for both vocational/technical programs and continuing education. The largest number of them (9) considered vocational education to be the main priority of community colleges, with transfer education second (7). Three responses to the question on educational priorities were categorized under "continuing education and general education."

Five of the presidents felt that they had successfully implemented vocational/technical programs on their campuses commensurate with their goals, this being the largest number of responses to any of the categories of program implementation. The largest number of responses concerning desired further improvements had to do with vocational education and continuing and general education (4 each).

The mixed responses concerning vocational/technical education and continuing education among the different administrators reflected almost a reversal of opinions at certain points. Consequently, while the topics seemed much in their minds, conclusions and directions to be drawn from their perspectives remain unclear other than that, from their point of view, the issues of vocational and continuing education are possibly important, but not worrisome.

Dynamics of College Attendance

Students obviously have reasons for attending college that are important to them, and they operate under certain constraints in selecting a

particular college. If faculty and administrators are not aware of their students' motivations for attendance, neither will they be apt to know sufficiently what their needs are, once they are enrolled. As was discussed in Chapter 5, the students surveyed were asked several questions regarding their college choice. The instructional and vocational deans were also asked what they thought motivated students to attend their colleges.

As the student profiles showed, the most important reasons these students gave for attending any college were "to enter a career in business or a profession," and "to obtain skills and training for a job." The next two most frequent responses were "to get a broad liberal education and appreciation of ideas," and "to develop my knowledge and interest in community and world affairs."

One might be justifiably impressed with the seriousness and responsibility of the items chosen by the students in this regard. Social aspects of attending college or choosing a particular college are not just secondary in their minds, but are far removed from reported conscious consideration. Marriage, social life, student government, peer attendance, and athletics all together accounted for less than one percent of the items of first importance for going to college, only four percent of second importance, and ten percent of third importance.

Comparison of these responses to those concerning vocational preparation demonstrates the degree to which vocational benefits are foremost in students' minds. Social interests pale even more when compared to students' desire to know more about "community and world affairs" and to obtain "a broad liberal education and appreciation of ideas," as 14 percent chose those categories as their most important reason for attending college, 32 percent indicated them as a secondary concern, and 38 percent felt that such benefits were third most important to their decision to attend college.

When asked the three main reasons why they were attending a particular college, the students overwhelmingly indicated "The Three C's": low cost, particular courses, and closeness to home. Table 8-2 exhibits the preponderance of these three reasons by showing the percentages of responses they received in each category with eleven optional reasons being available from which to choose. Over three-fourths of the students

chose one of these three reasons for attendance as being of foremost concern to them, and the same holds true with regard to their second choice. Cost and closeness were by far the most frequently indicated among all three choices.

The instructional deans seemed to have a clear understanding of their students' motivations for their college selection: ten of them indicated that the reason most students attended their particular college was to receive vocational training; eight said because of the low cost; and six felt that convenient location was a prime consideration. The vocational deans too, felt that vocational training was foremost in students' minds with nine out of the eleven responding to this question similarly. However, only three felt that low cost was a prime factor, and two indicated convenient location as of importance to the students. The second highest number of comments from vocational deans (five) centered upon a feeling that their students could not qualify for other institutions of higher education.

The disparity in these responses between the two types of deans may be due to a difference inherent in vocational program students, misperceptions on the part of the vocational deans, or a hesitation on the part of students and instructional deans to identify motivations or reasons for college attendance as seemingly demeaning or threatening. Yet, the fourth highest response in each of the three most important student-reported reasons for attendance (approximately 8 percent in each category of importance) was to "get my grades up and enter a four-year school."

Educational Needs, Objectives, and Benefits

Most of the community college students surveyed were attending college mainly to gain vocational/occupational skills; they chose colleges that would enable them to acquire these benefits at the lowest cost and within close proximity of their home. The evidence is that they also assumed that completion of studies at their particular college would fulfill their objectives. Moreover, they were quite sanguine about the matter: almost all of them (95 percent) thought that they at least "may make it," including 37 percent who expressed this opinion specifically and a majority (58 percent) who said that they were "certain" of completing their studies.

The most prevalent student aspiration by far was that of transferring to a four-year school (61 percent), usually with an associate degree first, with the next largest percentage (16 percent) desiring an associate degree only. About 60 percent of the students were relatively sure that they would earn an associate degree from the school in which they were currently enrolled, and 61 percent were relatively sure of a bachelor's degree after transferring. These figures correspond with those reported by junior college students for the past several years, in spite of the great odds against such high proportions of students realizing these plans as indicated by the research to date (see Volume I of The Study of Junior Colleges). Consequently the data provide further basis for the increased concern on the part of the community colleges to bring abilities and aspirations of their students into a more clear perspective. This concern, however, appears somewhat wanting in light of the responses of principal personnel interviewed in the course of the present study.

The largest percentage of the vocational and instructional deans designated the major educational needs of their students as vocational and career training and basic (remedial) education. But in contrast to the faculty, the vocational deans mentioned personal development only as a third major need; this need was not brought up by any of the instructional deans.

Only four of the vocational deans felt that their guidance and counseling programs were meeting students' educational needs, and only three of them felt that their schools had remedial programs that were beneficial to student needs. Three instructional deans felt that remedial programs represented an effort on their campuses to meet the needs of students, and three others felt the same way with regard to their placement offices. In general, only limited numbers of the two groups of deans felt that they were meeting student needs in at least a satisfactory fashion.

The faculty, in response to questions concerning the amount of certain educational benefits they felt their students were receiving and should be receiving, exhibited a wide degree of dissatisfaction with the current condition of all 17 benefits presented to them (item 40, Appendix D). The 17 benefits can be grouped into four dimensions: vocational, humanistic, human relations, and critical thinking. Table 8-3 indicates the average

proportion of the faculty that felt their students actually benefited "very much" in each of the four areas versus the proportion of the faculty that would have preferred their students to benefit "very much" in these areas. Other possible responses were "some" and "little or none." The discrepancies between the proportion of faculty indicating what benefits their students were receiving and should receive "very much" ranged between approximately 23 and 38 percent across the four areas. The greatest discrepancy was in the area of critical thinking, and the least in vocational training. The least divergent individual item response showed a significant difference of about 14 percent in this category, while the largest single item percentage difference was approximately 55 percent.

Table 8-4 lists the four individual items which exhibited the largest differences between "actual" and "preferable" in the "very much" response category, and the three items with less than a 20 percent difference out of the 17 choices submitted to the faculty. The least divergent individual item response (14 percent) between "actual" and "preferable" responses was in the vocational category and concerned preparation for professional, scientific, or scholarly work. The largest single item difference (over 55 percent) had to do with writing and speaking skills in the humanistic category.

When asked to choose the one of the 17 items which they felt was the most important benefit, the faculty members most frequently chose the first four items in Table 8-5 which fell in the human relations, vocational, and critical thinking categories; they chose the last two items, in the human relations and vocational categories, the least often. Although job-related vocational training was stressed by the faculty, aspects of human development dominated in importance to the students from their point of view.

The above illustrations suggest that the faculty were somewhat divergent from the students and vocational and instructional deans in terms of the impact they desired their community colleges to have on their students. The deans and faculty may be equally aware of the intense vocational aspirations of their students, but the faculty may feel that "something is missing" from such a narrowly focused view of education and that they are in a position to enhance humanistic and human relations growth and development through the classroom experience. Perhaps they are more aware of

unexpressed individual student needs because of their daily interaction with them, taking the vocational/occupational preparation needs of their students and the colleges' responses to them for granted, and would like to see other dimensions emphasized more. One does not necessarily exclude the other.

Counseling Needs, Objectives, and Benefits

Thirteen of the 15 pupil personnel deans indicated that a major counseling need of their students was one of receiving vocational and occupational information, and the same number of them indicated personal problems and development as a major need. Academic and financial problems were both mentioned by 7 of the deans. Two of them pointed out the need for transfer information. These five problems represented the range of needs perceived by the chief student personnel executives, most of them indicating more than one.

The on-line counselors were presented with an open-ended question of the same sort when asked to list major problems of their students; their responses are shown in Table 8-6, which displays data considered in the previous chapter.

The categorical intent of the responses from counselors and pupil personnel deans appears to be quite similar, though terminology such as "uncertainty of future" and "unrealistic aspirations" is not really clear enough to make definite comparisons, as both of them could apply to vocational, academic, personal, or financial concerns in individual cases.

The diversity of student needs and problems from their own perceptions was quite apparent and not entirely in agreement with the perceptions of their faculty and administrators. Identifying areas in which they "have at some time needed help" from a list of 18 problems enumerated in the Student Profiles, the students chose only one item with less than a 10 percent frequency, that item concerning academic probation. Only four other choices received less than a 20 percent response. All of the five highest responses, ranging from 32 percent to 65 percent, dealt with academic problems, while the three items concerning various personal problems elicited responses ranging from 12 to 21 percent, and the two related to vocational considerations received 12 and 24 percent.

There is a fairly large discrepancy in several instances between the percentage of students who indicated that they needed help in a specific area and the percentage who actually talked to counselors regarding their problem (see Chapter 5). Most students who did seek out their counselors, however, reported that they were helpful. Paradoxically, the area where the highest percentage of counselor help was received was generally that of personal problems, though this was also the area where generally the lowest percentage of those needing assistance actually turned to their counselors.

Perhaps the most important discrepancy, however, is that between the counselors' and students' perceptions. A much larger proportion of counselors felt that the students had major problems to deal with than the students reported to be the case. A major need, therefore, may be to acquaint the students with their problems, if they exist, in a way that they can deal with them effectively. The various data in The Study of Junior Colleges have caused this to be a recurrent theme throughout the study's reports.

The counselors' reports of time devoted to various problems in carrying out their duties is fairly congruent with problems as perceived by student personnel deans, students, and the counselors themselves. To recapitulate findings from Chapter 7; 50 percent of the counselors devoted 35 percent or more of their time to student program planning, 25 percent or more to vocational guidance, 15 percent to other academic problems, and 15 percent to personal problems. Only 20 percent of the counselors indicated that they spent any amount of time on problems other than these four.

Thirteen pupil personnel deans responded to a question regarding the proportion of their students utilizing their colleges' counseling services, with nine of them indicating that all or almost all of their students do so. Four replied that only half or less do. The students were queried in a related fashion, being asked to indicate the number of times they typically talked with a counselor during a semester. As indicated in Chapter 5, only 14 percent of the continuing students and 9 percent of the first semester students reportedly did not utilize counselors. However, another 50 percent of the former and 35 percent of the latter saw their counselors only once

during a term. Five or more contacts were reported by 6 percent and 5 percent of the two groups, respectively. The suggestion was made in an earlier chapter that, once class programming is discounted, very few students reported real "utilization" of their counseling services, a problem that surely deserves more attention in light of the students' needs.

Accessibility of counselors appears to be judged favorably by both themselves and the students they serve; only 2 percent of the counselors indicated that students have to wait a long time for an appointment, and only 5 percent of the students reported that making appointments is "very difficult."

Yet, 40 percent of the students reported having appointments of less than 15 minutes in length and only about 6 percent of them saw a counselor for more than 30 minutes in a typical session. The counselors' perceptions of appointment time vary considerably from those of the students, as only 6 percent reported their average session to be less than 15 minutes and 31 percent said that sessions were typically over 30 minutes in length. The three variables among the two groups are compared in Table 8-7, exhibiting almost a reversal of opinion. Almost all of the counselors (nearly 91 percent) felt the average reported appointment length to be sufficient. This situation again raises questions about students' ability to make real use of counseling services when their allotted time is so brief, even if they elect to contact a counselor outside of class programming.

Evaluation of Student Personnel Programs

Eleven of the 13 pupil personnel deans interviewed responded "yes" to a question concerning whether or not they had means of evaluating their counseling program, although they added that in most instances such evaluation takes place solely by informal means. Both the faculty and students were reported to be sources for these informal evaluations. The students were used much more, however; the faculty was used as the main source of evaluation information at only one institution.

Feedback from those being directly or tangentially served by counselors could be an important source of formal or informal evaluation of the effectiveness of a counseling program. In this survey, 44 percent of the

counselors reported systematic feedback from students, 38 percent indicated that they received the same from administrators, and 35 percent felt that such was the case in terms of faculty input concerning their counseling programs.

The tentative conclusion drawn here from the above data, therefore, is that the pupil personnel deans and counselors had diverse opinions concerning the amount of evaluation and feedback being carried on at their colleges, or at least communicated, regarding their counseling programs.

Systematic feedback was obtained from the students and faculty in the present survey, however, at least in the form of reported opinions. As indicated in Chapters 5 and 6, both the students and faculty were requested to evaluate nine aspects of student personnel programs with reference to their college as "strong", "average" or "weak." Unfortunately in this instance, the students were also given an additional option of "no opinion," an option which many of them chose, thereby rendering direct comparisons of the two sets of data problematic. Table 8-8 shows the responses of both groups.

As shown in the table, the faculty members awarded their strongest approval to the areas of records and information, admissions and registration, and financial aid, whereas students included only admissions and registration from these three areas among their most favorable responses. The other two most favorable evaluations by students concerned the areas which one might term "pure" counseling--academic counseling and guidance, and vocational counseling and guidance, the two areas conversely receiving the highest percentages of "weak" evaluation responses from the faculty. Students and faculty both awarded student activities high percentages in the "weak" category with the students giving that area their highest negative response.

As pointed out in Chapter 5, any of the students' reports about, or evaluation of, counselors and counseling activities should be interpreted in light of their previously reported minimal exposure to counseling services. Perhaps this accounts for the large percentage of "no opinion" responses from them in Table 8-8.

A final evaluation question about the colleges' student personnel programs concerns the extent that counselors, so important to these

programs, were also involved with the regular academic programs or isolated from them. Almost two-thirds (60 percent) of the counselors reported that they have "considerable input and influence" on school policies related to the counseling program, and an additional 35 percent indicated that they had opportunities for "some limited input."

Counselors had less reported influence on curriculum and course development, however. Curriculum planning, input, and impact from counselors are activities which often elicit mixed emotions from those concerned with community colleges. When it does exist, this impact also is carried out in various ways. Eight of the student personnel deans mentioned that their counselors do have an opportunity to become involved in this area, and over 68 percent of the counselors felt that they had either a great deal (15 percent) or some limited (53 percent) opportunities to participate in curricular development. Thirty-two percent indicated that they could make no inputs to curriculum and course development.

Even though nine of the colleges reportedly had counselors on institutional committees, only six of these colleges overlap with those where curriculum impact was evident. The deans in two of the colleges, without any directly related questions asked of them regarding the topic, pointed out that their counselors have no impact on the curriculum. Also, two colleges having counselors on committees were among the three whose pupil personnel deans mentioned that communication between counselors and the rest of the college was bad. On the other hand, all four of the colleges where the deans stressed the presence of good communication also had counselors represented on curricular committees.

These data do not substantiate arguments either in favor of or against the presence of counselors on community college curriculum committees, though they do give credence to an attitude that physical presence and structured input are only as valuable as the persons to which a college awards them, regardless of the intent. It is interesting to note that the third most frequent suggestion (missing second by only one percent) made by counselors concerning recommended improvements in the student personnel program was that of improving the quality of counselors.

Community Benefits and Activity

Of the 12 presidents responding to a question concerning their colleges' relationship to their communities, only one felt it to be unsatisfactory, while seven of them assessed their relationships as excellent. The remainder gave responses of good or adequate.

No doubt the colleges must somehow be aware of the needs of their communities and be responding to them for such apparently satisfactory relationships to occur. According to the vocational and instructional deans, almost all of the colleges surveyed carry out studies of various levels of sophistication which give them beneficial information concerning their communities. In addition, many of them, especially in the vocational areas, rely heavily on their advisory boards for such information. This assessment, however, must be matched against the lack of critical information in the Institutional Profiles discussed in Chapter 3 and contained in Appendix A.

But regardless of existing information bases, both of these groups of deans pointed out career/vocational training and counseling and remedial education as the two major needs they perceived in their communities. The vocational deans stressed a need for heretofore excluded groups (non-Anglos, the educationally disadvantaged, and women) to be included among those members of the community receiving benefits from their colleges as their third greatest area of community concern, whereas none of the instructional deans mentioned this factor. Rather, the deans of instruction ranked the need for a change in attitude towards career/vocational education in order to encourage more students to pursue such interests as their third most important community concern. In addition, many of the deans felt that there was a growing effort on the part of their colleges in the whole area of community outreach.

Evaluation of college programs designed for the communities' benefit is difficult. However, to obtain some index of the colleges' effectiveness in this regard 12 instructional deans were questioned regarding how well their colleges had been responding to locally relevant community needs. Nine of them said "well", five said "satisfactorily", and eight of them said "unsatisfactorily." The number of responses in this instance was more

than the number of deans asked, since they were referring to more than one need. One cannot be certain if these responses are comparable across the colleges, however, since one college could be doing quite a good job in this regard but have an increased awareness of need and a stronger commitment than another college, and because of this give itself a lower rating. The opposite could also be the case.

The faculty members, in turn, were asked to identify the three most important benefits they perceived their communities should ideally receive. Selected results of their responses, previously discussed in Chapter 6, are shown in Table 8-9. As can be seen from the table, the faculty generally exhibited negligible differences in their perceptions of what was being accomplished and what should be in respect to their three most frequently and three least frequently chosen items. Even more interesting, perhaps, is the fact that of 11 variables listed (item 46, Appendix D), in only two instances are there differences in ranking of the proportions of faculty indicating what benefits their communities were currently receiving from their colleges and what they should be receiving ideally.

Thus apparently the faculty were quite certain that their ideals with regard to community benefits were being realized. Moreover, these preferred benefits corresponded with those advocated by their deans. These data suggest that either the community colleges are carrying out these functions beyond all expectations, or that there may exist some confusion of incantation with actuality. The discussion in Chapter 6 of the faculty members' stress upon the importance of giving time to students versus the negligible amount of time they reported with students outside of class comes to mind here.

Indirect benefits from a college also accrue to its community informally by virtue of faculty participation in community activities. The data compiled regarding such activities seems to demonstrate that the faculty were involved in their communities. Again as discussed in Chapter 6, evidence of this phenomenon includes the fact that 86 percent of the faculty participated in the last local election, 47 percent contributed time or money to civic projects, and 34 percent had some personal contact with community officials in the year previous to the survey.

Several other activities received larger or equal percentages than those exemplified, though adequate evaluative comments on any of them need to await comparable data concerning community members outside the community colleges.

Faculty Qualifications

A concluding issue, considered only briefly, raises questions about the recruitment of the faculty who are to carry out the programs designed for the students' and communities' benefit. The faculty members and vocational and instructional deans were asked their opinions concerning the most important qualifications for a community college instructor. The responses given are shown in Tables 8-10 and 8-11.

Foremost in the minds of both groups was a concern for interest in students, a point demonstrated earlier. Yet, whereas the faculty ranked work experience outside the classroom as being of secondary importance, only one dean indicated that as a concern. Furthermore, the faculty considered teaching experience at the junior college level as their third most important consideration, while only one dean mentioned the need for teaching experience at any level. These matters are discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 6.

The faculty members appear to have different expectations of their colleagues than the deans have, and the processes of hiring and promotion should certainly take these into account as they relate to individual campuses. If differences cannot be reconciled, the differing amounts of responsibility for hiring and promotion between the faculty and their deans at particular institutions will surely cause the balance to shift one way or the other. If that happens, there is a potential for either an unhappy faculty or a frustrated administration.

Conclusions

The foregoing review of many of the most apparent present and future concerns of community colleges, presented by means of comparisons of attitudes between various sectors of the community college scene, awards one

a juxtaposition of both a clearer picture of the realities of the situation and the resulting difficulty of not being able to present an exacting description of "the way it is" or "the way it will be." In several of the categories discussed, the most precise statements that can be made are those representing disagreement between two or more sectors. In such instances, the trends will move in the direction of the attitudes of those who now have, or will develop, the most influence.

Group struggles for power to implement changes in desired directions have been evident over the past few years, most prevalently in student and faculty ranks. Changes have been experienced on various campuses in markedly different directions, depending on the degrees of power held by each of the many sectors influencing the community college. In view of the evident disagreement among them in certain instances, information is needed on the national trends in the sources and nature of power and influence over the topics discussed. It is somewhat easier to distinguish such trends on individual campuses, and these are not congruent.

Even if this comparative analysis would have been able to report wide-ranging areas of agreement among faculty, counselors, students, and administrators, one would have been confronted with some very influential groups which were considered only indirectly in this study. Other segments of community college influence have their own power base, and are able to enhance or dissipate that of those segments already considered.

Most obvious among these is the community to which individual colleges are more or less committed. An outgrowth of this is surely the local boards to which the colleges are responsible and the proliferation of advisory boards to which they are responsive, in spite of the little importance the faculty apparently placed on these boards (see Chapter 6). Anticipated increases in state and federal support will also have their impact on future directions and programs.

Future studies of this kind would benefit greatly by inclusion of the above-mentioned groups. The problems arising due to the method of analysis carried out in the current study would be heightened by their inclusion. Thus an effort toward the use of certain types, wording, and commonality of questions becomes even more apparent if the need for more sophisticated and concentrated research in the area of consensus-disagreement between the

various segments of two-year colleges is to be met in an effort to assess more reliably characteristics, trends, and needed future directions of community colleges.

CHAPTER 9

EPILOGUE

The Study of Junior Colleges was a multi-purpose exploratory study undertaken by the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation for the U.S. Office of Education. One of the principal aims of the study was to identify major issues and problems facing the junior colleges and to gather preliminary data and present findings which might serve as a beginning informational basis for policy and program planning in the junior colleges.

The study investigated a variety of questions and utilized a number of different research techniques. In the initial stages of the program, a thorough review of a large body of pertinent literature was undertaken in order to identify major issues and to assess the nature of the efforts to deal with them. In addition, a number of national conferences with leading junior college officials and analysts were monitored by the project's staff. Subsequently a special supplement to the Office of Education's Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) system focusing on the two-year college was developed, pretested, and revised for field testing by the Office of Education. In subsequent stages, 15 junior colleges of various characteristics were selected as a sample. Extensive interviews, ranging over a wide spectrum of issues, were held with the presidents, deans of instruction, deans of vocational education, deans of student personnel services, and chief fiscal officers of each participating institution; a content analysis of these interview responses provided invaluable information on major issues from the perspective of the officials most closely involved in the day-to-day operations of the colleges. In addition, separate questionnaires were developed for each of the following groups: counselors, faculty, and students. These instruments were designed to provide information on the characteristics of each of these populations, their attitudes and perspectives on a variety of issues, and their performance within the institutions. Finally, based on numerous internal documents and reports, HEGIS reports, accreditation reports, and other publications, a descriptive institutional profile was

developed for each participating institution. These data constitute a rich vein of knowledge about the nature of the junior colleges which has, due to the time constraints on this project, been only partially mined.

The purpose of this chapter is to highlight, in a general and summary form, some major themes and findings discussed in this volume's previous chapters. Volume III of The Study of Junior Colleges contains the multivariate analysis of the project's survey data and the measurements and prototypic instruments derived from these analyses for the purpose of future evaluative research and informational surveys. As will be noted from the following summary discussion, the nature of this study is by design that of a far-ranging, general, and exploratory survey, rather than an in-depth and definitive analysis of specific issues.

Definition of Goals

One of the major issues facing the junior colleges, which is notable both for its fundamental importance and for the relative infrequency with which it is seriously discussed among educators, analysts, and junior college officials, is the definition of the goals or aims of the junior colleges. In a period of great flux, one looks largely in vain in the professional literature for any general theoretical or philosophical discussion of what the junior college is, or should be, trying to achieve.

In the national conferences monitored by the project's staff, a few voices called for a serious consideration of the goals of the junior colleges, but these have apparently been muted by the discussion of more immediate operational matters. There seems to be a prevailing assumption that the aims of the junior college have been clearly defined once and for all, and that they are obvious to all concerned. It is increasingly clear, however, that definition of goals is an on-going endeavor, and that goals are not currently well enough articulated or understood, either by segments within the colleges or by segments in the surrounding communities.

Not only is the lack of concern with the definition of goals notable in the literature and in the proceedings of national conferences, it was also apparent in the interviews with chief administrative officers of the schools participating in this survey. They did not perceive it as a major problem, nor did they for the most part define their own roles as requiring

a definition of goals. Moreover, many schools did not appear to have effective mechanisms for systematic consideration of this issue: the faculty, students, and even the general public often lacked effective channels of input to the definition of the goals of the junior colleges.

Junior College Presidents

The literature which deals with the role of the junior college president suggests that there is a trend toward a managerial definition of this office. Recruitment to these positions increasingly emphasizes administrative skills, and demands of the office increasingly engage the incumbents in considerations of money and management. The danger is that as administrative and managerial concerns become predominant presidents will tend to surrender their responsibilities as educational leaders. Interviews with participating college officials likewise suggested that this is the case in many colleges. At the same time, interviews with college officials indicated that presidents and deans are concerned with a growing resistance on the part of the faculty to administrative leadership. The extent to which this latter concern is a function of the former issue has not been systematically explored either in national conferences or in the literature.

Governance and Decision-Making

The proceedings of some of the national conferences cited as one of the most serious problems facing the junior college the dangers posed by the framework of controls of educational operations and programs which exist at the present time at the state and national levels. This concern was repeated many times in interviews with college officials. There appears to be an increasing shift in decision-making authority away from local community officials and college officers toward state and national educational agencies.

This trend is in large measure a result in changes in funding procedures. As enrollments increase and the costs of new educational programs rise, the colleges find themselves more and more dependent upon financial support which state and national agencies can provide. The funding procedures of these agencies result in their having greater control over the operations of the local colleges. The authority of state agencies is enhanced by funding arrangements which channel most federal subsidies

through state agencies which in turn reallocate them among the various educational institutions within the state.

Although such centralization provides some benefits in terms of standardization of procedures and standards, and provides for coordination of educational efforts, junior college officials also noted that it often results in bureaucratic inflexibility which jeopardizes the ability of the college to respond to the unique needs of the particular community. Moreover it commonly requires an inordinate effort in terms of voluminous and repetitious reports and audits which place heavy burdens on the administrative resources of the colleges. Another problem that deserves attention in this context is the high rate of dissatisfaction that the faculty surveyed expressed toward the local governing boards and especially toward their state governing agencies.

Finance

Although comparatively little attention has been devoted to the issue of junior college finances in the literature and in the proceedings of national conferences, this issue was cited as a major problem by the college officials interviewed more frequently than any other single operational problem. Money for construction of physical facilities, for salaries, for educational equipment, and for in-service training of personnel seems to be in chronic short supply in many cases. Junior college officials complain that they are the orphans of higher education, with less money and more students than the four-year colleges. And, as the participants of one national conference noted, increasing educational costs at the local level are having a selective impact on different groups, with an increasing part of the financial burden falling on lower-income people. There appears to be little innovation in terms of alternative funding procedures, however.

The issue of finances also bears directly on the students. The students surveyed reportedly had very limited financial resources. At the same time data in the institutional profiles indicate that most of their colleges allocate only small proportions of their budgets to student financial aid. This may be occasioned on the relatively nominal federal support for financial aid reported by most of the institutions.

Remedial Instructional Programs

Remedial education is fast becoming one of the largest instructional endeavors of the junior colleges. Junior colleges have a disproportionately high number of disadvantaged and low-achieving students. If the open-door promise is to be fulfilled, these efforts will need to be expanded and improved even further. Yet studies and interviews have suggested that these programs are often inadequately funded and staffed, and to a large extent ineffectual. Remedial programs vary widely in terms of content and quality, making comparisons of their impact extremely difficult.

Although some of the research reported in the literature shows that remedial instruction can have a positive impact on students, there is a considerable body of opposing literature which shows that such programs in a large proportion of schools have not caused students to persist longer, drop fewer courses, or earn better grades than comparable students without such instruction.

Little attention has been given to related areas such as student motivation and learning theories which might guide such remedial endeavors. The survey of junior college students revealed that 17 percent of all students were enrolled in some kind of remedial class. Of those in remedial courses, the greatest number were found in English and mathematics classes. On the other hand, it was found that most of the attention to remediation in the literature focuses on reading remediation. Although the highest percentage of students enrolled in remedial classes are found in institutions located in low socioeconomic communities, even the schools in middle range socioeconomic communities had significant proportions of their students in such programs. Apparently examination should be made of the need for and means to expand, improve, and evaluate these programs.

Vocational Education

In spite of the rather extensive literature on vocational education, we know relatively little about the students in these curricula or the impact of such instruction on the students. The findings indicate that many students are reluctant to enroll in terminal occupational programs, even when they realistically assess themselves as non-academic, because of the low prestige connected with such programs. Moreover, many schools

do not have an adequate range of course offerings in the vocational field. The contention that the junior colleges devote much of their energies to terminal programs is not substantiated by studies reported in the literature. This situation is not really corroborated by this project's survey, however.

In terms of academic potential, the literature suggests that students who enroll in vocational/technical curricula are, on the average, below the norm. Moreover, few vocational students have fathers with any college experience. The most dependable predictors as to which students will enroll in vocational courses have been found to be a combination of socioeconomic factors and scholastic rank, that is, students of low socioeconomic backgrounds and of low high school scholastic standing are more likely to be found in vocational programs.

The survey found that 40 percent of the sample of junior college students are in declared terminal majors. Relatively few had attended public trade/technical high schools, and few had taken a vocational arts course of study in high school.

An analysis of the questionnaire responses also indicated that vocational high school backgrounds are heavily represented in minority schools, implying that minority students may be trapped in vocational pursuits, although this was not necessarily indicated in the survey. Further analysis should clarify this issue.

Counseling Services

Guidance and counseling is considered by many as one of the principal functions of the junior colleges. Given the multiplicity of curricula, the uncertainty of students regarding their own interests, and the unrealistic assessment of their capabilities, counseling services have become an integral part of most junior college operations. However, the literature on junior college counseling services shows that there is a great deal of ambiguity and disorder in counseling programs, and a lack of agreement about what the programs should be attempting to accomplish. This conclusion was substantiated to some extent by the survey: in response to an open-ended question on what the counselor considered to be major problems in their programs, 10 percent cited the need to clarify the counseling role at their institution.

The literature also suggests a lack of professional leadership in the counseling field; another 10 percent of the counselors also spontaneously raised this issue as a major problem at the colleges. Moreover, although most junior colleges require either a student personnel credential or a Master's degree in counseling, many of the counselors who responded to the questionnaire called for improvements in counselor quality. The literature also points to a prevailing lack of in-service training for counselors, and to widespread understaffing of junior college counseling programs. Only 4 of the 15 colleges surveyed reported student/counselor ratios considered sufficient for an effective counseling program. This problem may be reflected by the fact that the majority of the students surveyed reported spending only 15 minutes a term with a counselor.

There are two major counseling orientations or perspectives operative in the junior colleges. First there can be noted a social ethic orientation which sees counseling as an endeavor aimed toward helping the student adjust to the needs and demands of the society and community, and to prepare him to be an efficient and productive worker in society. Recently there has developed a second orientation which embodies a more humanistic ethic; this perspective views counseling as an endeavor aimed toward enhancing the personal growth and flexibility of the student, his self-awareness, creativity, autonomy, and openness to experience. The interviews with counselors and counseling deans attempted to ascertain to what extent each of these orientations was operative in the counseling programs. In the colleges included within this survey, both humanistic and social ethos were operative, usually simultaneously, with the latter being stressed somewhat more forcefully than the former. The interviews suggested that personal counseling, which is an integral part of the humanist orientation, is not a top priority of many deans of student personnel services, and that many counseling staffs are not adequately prepared to deal with personal counseling. Moreover, although personal problems were identified by 34 percent of the counselors as a major student problem, personal counseling was not given as much attention by counselors as were other traditional counseling endeavors such as vocational guidance and testing, academic problem counseling, and particularly program planning.

The lack of emphasis on personal counseling, however, may be as much a function of student reluctance as it is of counselor disinclination and inadequacy. The students reported that they did not seek assistance from counselors on personal matters to a very great extent. Only 21 percent reported needing such counseling assistance, and only 11 percent reported talking to counselors about these matters. Nine percent of the students reported satisfaction with the personal counseling they received, however, representing a great majority of those who sought such help.

At the same time, there are some notable innovations in junior college counseling programs, although limited to a few schools. There appears to be a trend toward decentralization of the counseling function, placing counselors in specific academic divisions, and locating counseling facilities in easily accessible student areas. Increasing use is being made of para-professionals, especially student peer counselors. Moreover, the use of group counseling techniques seems to be growing. Expansion of these efforts linked with evaluative research indicating directions for their additional effectiveness and the radical reduction of the student/counselor ratios should greatly enhance the student opportunities for educational and personal development in these colleges.

Community Relations

Many observers note that one of the unique features of junior colleges is their close relationship with the surrounding community. The junior college is commonly conceived as the educational center for the community, and it aims to address the whole spectrum of educational needs in the community. The community relations efforts of many junior colleges have grown to encompass community services and community development endeavors far beyond the scope of traditional educational programs. Just what the proper scope of such community activities should be is becoming a major point of debate among college officials and analysts.

Whatever the outcome of that debate might be, there is obvious need for systematic gathering of information by the colleges concerning the communities in which they operate. Given the rapid changes in the social and economic composition of many college communities, there is a constant need for reevaluation of community needs and characteristics, and for reassessment of the impact of the college on the community. Interviews with

college officials and the institutional profile data, however, indicate that few colleges have developed the facilities required to provide an adequate flow of community information needed for program planning and evaluation. There is no wonder, therefore, that participants of national conferences are citing with increasing frequency the need for research to meet community needs. Likewise, the literature on college-community relations suggests that few colleges have community service departments or officers, in spite of a rather dramatic increase in community service efforts. One must conclude that much of this effort proceeds on the basis of impressionistic and sporadic information regarding the community, rather than on a systematic and periodic survey of community characteristics and needs.

Faculty

Relations between faculty and administrators is looming as one of the major problems for junior colleges in the decade to come. This issue was cited as problematic with great frequency by the officials interviewed in the study and was pointed out by a number of the faculty surveyed. Administrative officers often feel that faculties are attempting to influence policy-making far beyond what administrators consider to be their proper role. In some instances this dispute stems from an inability to reconcile the goal of the open-door college espoused by the administration and the goal of maintaining standards of academic excellence espoused by many of the faculty. There is no consensus of opinion in the literature regarding the proper balance in faculty-administrative relations, but many participants of national conferences have cited the need for a more participatory structuring of authority in the junior colleges which would allow for more faculty input. The desirability of participatory policy formation and implementation free from the interference of state and local governing agencies was certainly indicated by the faculty surveyed. This issue looms as a critical one for the junior colleges, and its resolution will greatly influence the direction which the colleges will take.

As for the faculty members themselves, much could be said on the basis of the survey. Only a few issues suggested by the voluminous data will be cited here as examples of the great need for further research in this area. (1) Generally the faculty were fairly involved in their

communities and tended toward "liberal" concerned positions regarding a variety of social issues of the day. But apparently a number of them were also relatively unsympathetic towards the needs of such groups as disadvantaged students. What effect then do faculty members have on their institutions and students, particularly if they have many disadvantaged students? (2) They came from somewhat circumscribed cultural backgrounds. Does this limit their ability to stimulate their students' cultural and intellectual interests? (3) Only a distinct minority of them were trained especially to teach in a junior college and yet the research indicates that teaching effectiveness in community colleges is superior among those instructors who have had such training compared to those who have not. How advisable is it to recruit teachers from high schools and four-year colleges? If this procedure is appropriate should it be accompanied by in-service training? (4) Twenty percent of the faculty reportedly were working on their doctorates--a much larger percentage than those who actually had attained their doctoral degrees. If most of those engaged in doctoral work complete it, how will this affect their careers and institutions particularly in light of the concern expressed by many junior college administrators about having faculty with doctoral degrees on their staff? (5) A great many of the faculty worked at their own institution or elsewhere in addition to their full-time jobs. Many worked 20 hours or more a week at non-teaching jobs. How does this affect the commitment and energy they bring to their institutions and roles as teachers? (6) They placed top priority on interest in student problems and activities. Yet they spent most of their time on classroom activities, interacting very little with students outside of class either individually or in respect to student activities. Is it possible to "teach" only in a classroom setting? Is it possible to meet the needs of the diverse students attending junior college without considerable student-faculty (and student-counselor) interaction? Would reduced class loads encourage and enhance non-class teaching? (7) Most of the faculty followed traditional lines of instructional techniques and student evaluation. How sympathetic are they to educational development and innovation and to what extent are they really engaged in these endeavors? How effective is teaching in the junior college compared to

teaching in four-year colleges and universities? (8) They felt that their students had a great many more academic problems than the students reported feeling about themselves. What should be done about their differences of opinion in this crucial area? (9) The faculty felt that the most important student educational benefits or outcomes to be their personal, social, and vocational development. But they reported that most students realized only vocational benefits. Many of them also felt that their students were not given sufficient opportunity to expand their cultural, societal, and intellectual interests and understanding. What is the truth of this situation, and if it is true, how can it be changed? (10) A majority of the faculty expressed that they were generally satisfied with important aspects of their colleges and that they preferred to teach at a junior college. However, many expressed dissatisfaction with various aspects of their college's life and students, and 40 percent would prefer to work elsewhere, mostly at a four-year college or university. Moreover, nearly 70 percent would prefer that their children attend a four-year college or university. How do those attitudes affect institutional morale, spirit and teaching effectiveness? What, if anything, should be done about this situation?

Student Characteristics

Junior college students are extremely heterogeneous. They differ greatly within institutions and among institutions. Generalizations are extremely difficult on the basis of student responses to the project's mailed questionnaires. Certain patterns did emerge, however. The junior college students were, for the most part, educated in public high schools. The majority did not take college preparatory courses of study in high school, and a large proportion did not decide to attend college until late in their high school careers or even after high school. A majority of them indicated that they chose to attend their college because it was close to home or because of its low cost. The specific courses offered were also a principal factor in their decision to attend.

Approximately one-third of the junior college students were married, and over 70 percent of those had at least one child. Less than half lived with parents or relatives. In terms of their psychological orientations the junior college students were generally self-confident

individuals, had a high estimation of their personal worth, had high career aspirations, believed that ambition is an important ingredient to their success in life, and rejected the notion that they had personal or academic problems that would prevent their realizing their educational objectives. They spent relatively few hours per week in class, and relatively few hours studying. Thirty-six percent of the students surveyed spent only six hours or less a week in class, and 52 percent reported they studied six hours or less per week. Most of their families' financial resources were highly limited, yet most of the students did not expect financial problems to hinder their education. Almost all of the students were working or expected to work while going to college. Perhaps they were sanguine about supporting themselves and their education through their own resources. In any event, very few of the students had received loans or a scholarship, and many were not even aware of their existence.

The record of junior college students referred to throughout the project's reports strongly indicates the need for intensive counseling and educational program development based on sound research, which will help those students become more aware of their potentials and problems instead of repeating the pattern of early withdrawal from college currently characteristic of junior college students.

Evaluation

Several participants in the national conferences have called for special efforts to provide for the evaluation of performance in the junior colleges--both administrative and instructional. However, the conclusion of the present study is that evaluation is a matter which is very unevenly attended to in junior colleges. Although a few colleges have standardized, periodic means of evaluating the performance of faculty, counselors, community service programs, remediation programs, or long-range employment patterns of graduating students, this is far from the norm. Institutional research facilities are rudimentary at best in most cases. Data bases for planning are typically indirect and impressionistic. A consistent theme in conversations with junior college officials was the need for such institutional research facilities.

Cost seemed to be the primary obstacle to their establishment. It is also an obstacle to needed research and development in higher education nationally and regionally.

There, then, are some of the major issues and some of the preliminary findings of the Study of Junior Colleges. The nature of the study was exploratory rather than prescriptive; the aim was to establish an empirical informational basis which might prove useful in future planning and policy-making. Indeed, The Study of Junior Colleges generated a wealth of data, much of which has been only initially surveyed; further analyses could yield even further insights into the nature of these issues.

Only a few of the numerous variables examined in the study were enumerated in this chapter. Most of them differentiated the 15 institutions surveyed with a high degree of statistical significance. Volume III points out a number of these variables which serve as predictors of various criteria important to student development. The urgent need is to further refine the measurement of the variables and make much greater use of them on a broader base of institutions. The consequent greater understanding to be gained of the differential institutional impact on student growth and development is essential to positive program planning and development.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A.W., Panos, R.J., & Creager, J.A. National norms for entering college freshmen--Fall, 1966. ACE Research Reports, 1967, 2(1). Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.
- American Association of Junior Colleges. 1970 junior college directory. Washington: Author, 1970.
- Baird, L.J., & Holland, J.L. The flow of high school students to schools, colleges, and jobs. ACT Research 26. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1968.
- Berg, E.H., & Axtell, D. Programs for disadvantaged students in California community colleges. Oakland, California: Peralta Junior College District, 1968.
- Bushnell, D.S., & Zagaris, S. Strategies for change. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972.
- Clark, B.R. The open door college. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Cohen, A.M. Dateline '79: Heretical concepts for the college. Beverly Hills: Glencoe, 1969. (a)
- Cohen, A.M. The relationships among student characteristics, changed instructional practices and student attrition in junior college. U.S.O.E. Project No. 8-1-055. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1969. (b)
- Cross, K.P. The junior college student: A research description. Princeton: Educational Testing Services, 1968.
- Feldman, K.A., & Newcomb, T.M. The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Godfrey, E. Study of community colleges and vocational-technical education centers. Washington: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1969.
- Hendrix, V.L. Functional relationships of junior college environments and selected characteristics of faculties, students, the administration and the community. Final Report. Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Research, 1969.
- Hills, J.R. Transfer shock: The academic performance of the junior college transfer. Journal of Experimental Education, 1965, 33, 210-215.
- Hoyt, D.P., & Munday, L. Academic description and prediction in junior colleges. ACT Research Reports, 10. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1966.
- Johnson, B.L. Islands of innovation expanding. Beverly Hills: Glencoe, 1969.
- Knoell, D.M. A study of the college-going behavior of urban high school graduates, with particular attention to black youth not now in college. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

- Knoell, D.M., & Medsker, L.L. From junior to senior college: A national study of the transfer student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.
- Koos, L.V. The community college student. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970.
- MacMillan, T.F. Establishing a predictive model for early recognition of potential community college student attrition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969. (a)
- MacMillan, T.F. (Director). Norcal Project, Phase I: Final Report. Napa College, California, 1969. (b) (mimeo)
- Medsker, L.L., & Trent, J.W. The influence of different types of public higher institutions on college attendance from varying socioeconomic and ability levels. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1965.
- Pace, C.R. College and university environment scales, second edition: Technical manual. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
- Panos, R.J. Some characteristics of junior college students. ACE Research Reports, 1 (2). Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Richards, J.M., JR., & Braskamp, L.A. Who goes where to junior college? ACT Research Reports, 20. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1967.
- Richards, J.M., Jr., Rand, L.M., & Rand, L.P. A description of junior colleges. ACT Research Reports, 5. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1965. (a)
- Richards, J.M., Jr., Rand, L.P., & Rand, L.M. Regional differences in junior colleges. ACT Research Reports, 9. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1965. (b)
- Robinson, J.P., & Shaver, R.R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institution for Social Research, 1969.
- Tillery, H.D. Differential characteristics of entering freshmen at the University of California and their peers at California junior colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
- Trent, J.W. Catholics in college: Religious commitment and the intellectual life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Trent, J.W., & Medsker, L.L. Beyond high school: A psychosociological study of 10,000 high school graduates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Trent, J.W. The decision to go to college: An accumulative, multivariate process. CSE Report No. 64. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1970. (a)
- Trent, J.W. The circle of evaluation in the community college. CSE Report No. 63. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1970. (b)